

John Henry Davis,
10 Castle Street, Fleet Street.

THE NONCONFORMIST.

"The dissidence of dissent and the protestantism of the protestant religion."

No. 217.—VOL. V.

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1845.

PRICE 6d.

CONTENTS.	
ECCLÉSIASTICAL: —	POSTSCRIPT..... 243
Congregational Unionism—No. 6. Supplementary Observations	237
City Churches.....	237
The Maynooth Grant—Form of Petition—Meetings in the Metropolis—In the Provinces In Scotland—The Press—Abstract of the Bill—Miscellaneous	238
CORRESPONDENCE: —	246
The True Way to oppose the Maynooth Grant..	241
Leicestershire Justice ..	242
Homeopathy—a Mistake regarding it	242
METROPOLITAN	242
PROVINCIAL	242
LITERATURE: —	249
The Periodicals	249
Brief Notices.....	250
RELIGIOUS	250
MARRIAGES AND DEATHS	250
TRADE AND COMMERCE	250
ADVERTISEMENTS	251

Ecclesiastical Affairs.

CONGREGATIONAL UNIONISM. No. VI.

SUPPLEMENTARY OBSERVATIONS.

WE have done our work. We have fulfilled, according to our measure of ability, the promise we gave at starting. We were charged with a "preposterous" aversion to the union of congregational churches, and we have endeavoured to show that our aversion is not preposterous—that it has grown up out of considerations sufficiently important to entitle them to a fair hearing—that, if mistaken, it is not blind—if unable to make out a satisfactory justification of itself, it is not wholly devoid of reason. And now, with becoming reverence, we pause for a reply. It may be that our arguments do not require one—but, regarded as exponent of a growing, and already widely extended, feeling in our churches, we think it would be wise in the friends of the Congregational Union not to suffer them to pass in silence. This, however, is their own affair. We shall not presume to dictate their course—but we shall make bold to think, in case we are not answered, that the views we have put forth have some solid stuff in them.

Our objections may be thus summarily recapitulated. We are opposed to the Congregational Union because its objects are indefinite—because its attempted reforms must needs be superficial and delusive—because its instrumentalities is mainly sacerdotal—and because the mode of its rule is indirect and irresponsible. These are the main channels in which our objections run. We have contented ourselves with pointing them out, and would now merely remark that it was no part of our plan to trace out all the tributary streams which ultimately empty themselves into one or other of them. Our readers, we hope, will do this for themselves. Our business has been that of classification—and to this we have, as resolutely as possible, adhered.

It may be said that all human institutions are susceptible of abuse—that no organisation of men can be free from danger—that, nevertheless, they are capable of doing much good—and that it is the part of wisdom, not to destroy, but to control them—to check, to modify, to amend, to provide safeguards, to use vigilance, and so to conduct our opposition, as to leave them their whole power for good, and to nullify, as far as may be, their capabilities of mischief. Granted—on one condition—that you clearly show the good to be effected. We are far from assuming that the arguments we have ventured to adduce against the Union are unanswerable. Indeed, we can ourselves point out the kind of reply which will overset all our reasoning. Let it be clearly demonstrated that, during the past fifteen years, the Union has accomplished, for the denomination, objects sufficiently important to justify the risk to which it has exposed the liberty and independence of churches—let any great undertakings upon which it has entered be referred to—let it be shown, not only that these undertakings have made reasonable progress, but that such progress could not have been attained by other and less perilous combinations—let it be proved that the general action of the Union has been one of an elevating order, and that, so far as it has yet been able to stamp its own image upon religious society, it has secured the prevalence of

a higher, nobler, less sectarian, and more dignified spirit of ecclesiasticism—let facts illustrative of its eminent usefulness be arrayed, and a large amount of positive good traced to the wise and economical use of its own means—and, upon this ground, an appeal may be founded in its favour, which no observations of ours would be strong enough to resist. But, surely we ought not to be called upon to risk all that is dear to us, simply for the sake of an annual gathering of "the brethren," or of a hymn-book supplementary to Watts, whatever may be its merits. We must have some weightier reason for this organisation than a few treatises, and some indifferently written tracts. We want something better than reports and resolutions—and it is for the friends of the Union to show us what that better thing is.

We have already so far exceeded our limits in this discussion, as to leave ourselves without space for showing, as we might have done, wherein all true union consists. Suffice it now to observe, that we can discern none of the essential elements which enter into its composition in the organisation now under notice. It seems to us to be an outward combination, got up and sustained chiefly for its own sake—machinery created merely for as much as machinery brings with it an increase of power. "Who shall work it?" will prove a much more interesting question than, "To what beneficial purpose shall it be worked?" In a few years—if, unhappily, it should survive—there will arise a perpetual struggle between the "ins" and the "outs;" and in the congregational world we shall be destined to see another vivid but melancholy illustration of

"The good old plan,
That they should keep who have the power,
And they should get who can."

CITY CHURCHES.

MANY persons are of opinion that Lord Brougham's bill to abolish freedom fines is the precursor of extensive changes contemplated by government in the constitution of the corporation of London, and the citizens are already beginning to congratulate themselves upon the prospect of some reduction in the amount of their heavy local burdens. City householders, however, would do well to consider, that, much as a reform of the corporation may be needed, it is not the only measure required to improve the existing system of local administration. The church of England, as by law established, has something to do with City burdens, and we may briefly glance at the facts, as a striking instance of the unequal and oppressive operation, in a pecuniary sense, of the union of church and state.

The city of London contains a population of 125,000, and has no less than eighty-five churches, including St Paul's cathedral. The parish of Marylebone contains a population of 138,000, and has only seven churches. No wonder that the local rates of Marylebone should be lower than those of the City, without taking into the account the expenses of the mayoralty, and Mansion house festivities. Eighty-five churches involve the payment of salaries to at least eighty-five clergymen, eighty-five parish clerks, eighty-five vestry clerks, eighty-five sets of beadles, pew-openers, organists, sextons, and bell-ringers, to say nothing of the swarm of tradesmen who depend for their living upon the patronage of the churchwarden in procuring for them the opportunity of passing profitable bills for church repairs.

The annual amount of church rates and tithes raised in the City is £60,000, exclusive of £30,000 per annum trust property held by the parishes, devoted, for the most part, to church purposes; and exclusive, also, of the endowments of St Paul's cathedral. This is a munificent provision for the spiritual interests of the one-fifteenth section of the metropolis; and if the progress of religion depended upon establishments, we might undoubtedly regard the immediate neighbourhood of the stock exchange as the great centre for diffusing the influences of Christian civilisation. What are really the fruits of the system? The attendance in the whole eighty-five churches of the City is scarcely equal to that of any five congregations in dissenting chapels as usually filled, and it is impossible to enter the greater number during the hours of divine service without being forcibly reminded of the text "The voice of one crying in the wilderness." The writer of an article in a late number

of the *Westminster Review* gives the following account of the attendance at eighteen of the City churches, between half-past eleven and one o'clock in the morning of Sunday, April 23, 1843, as furnished by a correspondent:

"St Michael's, Cornhill; about 120 persons—seldom (I hear) so many.

"St Mildred's, Poultry; 80 persons.

"St Lawrence, Jewry, Cateaton street, a noble temple, would hold nearly 3000; I think about 20 persons (I could not count 20)!

"Bow church, Cheapside; not one-fiftieth full.

"St Mary, Aldermanbury, a beautiful church; about 40 persons.

"Allhallows, corner of Bread street and Watling street; about 30 persons.

"St Austin, corner of Old Change and Watling street; the best filled, nearly half full, say 150 persons.

"St Mary and St Gregory, Old Fish street, nearly 100 persons.

"St Nicholas; about one-fourth full.

"St Magnus, corner of Old Fish street hill and Thames street; not 20 persons.

"St Michael's, Queenhithe; 26 persons.

"St James, Garlick hill; about 50 persons.

"St Michael, College hill; about 30 persons.

"St Antholin, Watling street; under 100 persons.

"St Swithin's, Cannon street; nearly half full.

"St Mary Woolnoth, the church with a fine facade, corner of Lombard street; about 150 persons, Dr Birch, the rector, preaching.

"St Nicholas Acons, united with St Edmund the Martyr and King, Lombard street; about 65 persons.

"St Clement's, Clement's lane; under 77 persons.

"I lamented to see in most of these churches that, although the greater part of the pews were empty, the poor were only accommodated in the aisles."

This is a lamentable picture, and we quite agree with the writer in his remark, that it is surely a subject deserving not only the attention of government, but also of the Bishop of London, whether by a consolidation of some of these expensive establishments, the parishioners might not be relieved of a portion of their heavy burdens, or funds be provided for the new churches said to be required in other districts, and for which the public have been taxed. The voluntary system would, of course, put an end to the grievance; for whether the majority of householders in the City be dissenters or members of the church of England, we are quite satisfied that few among them would vote to be church-ridden exactly to the extent described. It is important, however, to bear in mind that in the City, as elsewhere, the supporters of a state church are not confined to the really earnest and conscientious members of the establishment. The following extract from the same number of the *Westminster Review* will show that other motives may be at work, while it affords another practical commentary upon the text, that "the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light!"

"CHURCH REPAIRS IN THE PARISH OF ST SEPULCHRE, CITY."

	£	s.	d.
Builders' contracts	4,555	0	0
Bill for extras	2,400	0	0
Upholsterer's bill, chiefly for cushions round the gallery	603	14	4
Velvet, fringe, floor cloth, &c.	43	5	0
Various tradesmen's bills, several of them furnished by churchwardens and members of the committee, for work which ought to have been included in the contracts.....	295	6	1
New clock	156	0	0
Repairing gas pipes, for which the original tender was under £25	133	0	0
Repairing the organ.....	258	0	0
Surveyors	300	0	0
Clerk of the works	180	0	0
Law expenses incurred in borrowing £6,000, as far as the charges are yet ascertained.....	551	4	4
Law expenses incurred by returning the £6,000, and borrowing £8,000 of another person	100	0	0

New bibles and prayer books for churchwardens' pews, although the same pews were well furnished with bibles and prayer books two years back. (The bookseller a nephew of the churchwarden)	80 0 0
Interest of money borrowed	128 8 11
Other charges unknown, but at least	216 1 0

"It is important to state that this expenditure for 1835 is only an addition to an annual charge of £283 (the average of six years) for work done by various parish tradesmen in repairs of the church, as reported in the printed accounts of the vestry. The income of the parish, chiefly derived from freehold property, and exclusive of rates, is about £2,000; of this sum, £1,590 are every year applied to purposes connected with the church. With so large a revenue it would seem possible to keep the roof from falling in without involving the parish £8,000 in debt, or exciting the rate-payers against the establishment by reviving the tithes. Among the auditors of the accounts of the vestry for 1834-5 appear the names of two of the tradesmen whose bills formed part of the accounts to be examined."

The parish of St Sepulchre is governed by a select vestry. The affairs of another select vestry, that of St Stephen's, Walbrook, under the direction of Mr Alderman Gibbs, now lord mayor, have become a subject of public notoriety. There are 112 parishes in the City, some of them not containing thirty houses, and the greater number are governed by select vestries, framed upon the same model. It is surely time for those who advocate endowments to devise some means for their protection.

THE GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.

PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.

The following form of petition, adopted by the independent dissenters of Kettering, we would recommend to general adoption amongst nonconformists, as briefly, but clearly and manfully, expressing their ground of opposition to the proposed Maynooth grant:—

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in parliament assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned inhabitants of Kettering, of the independent denomination, in the county of Northampton,

Sheweth—That your petitioners totally disapprove of the interference of the state in the affairs of religion, by giving any form of it either a legal establishment, or pecuniary aid.

That they earnestly desire to see all denominations of professing Christians, whether protestant or catholic, left to their own resources for the maintenance of their religious interests.

That, on this account solely, they deprecate the proposed grant to the college of Maynooth, and humbly pray your honourable House, both to withhold such grants and to withdraw from all other ecclesiastical communities existing in these realms, whatever emoluments they receive, and whatever property they hold by the favour of the state.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Printed or lithographed petitions will not be received. Petitions, consisting of more than one sheet, must bear some signatures upon the first sheet. If sent through the post, they must be left open at each end, and be addressed direct to the member for whom they are intended, either at his private residence or at the House of Commons. The words "petition to parliament," should be written on the outside. If these directions are accurately attended to, they will pass free of postage. Petitions may be forwarded for presentation to Mr Charles Hindley, Dartmouth house, Westminster; Mr Sharman Crawford, Cecil street, Strand; Mr Pattison, Upper Harley street, London; or to Mr Duncombe, Albany, Piccadilly.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND PETITIONING.—The scene every evening in the House of Commons, during the last week, vies with what took place during the agitation against the Factories Education bill. The floor of the house has been night after night covered with petitions. On Tuesday 137 petitions were presented; on Wednesday, 235; on Thursday, 556; and on Friday, 2,353—an unprecedented number to be presented on one occasion. This work occupied the House until a quarter to six o'clock. Mr Hindley alone presented 350 petitions against the grant. Sir R. Peel presented one in its favour from the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, who, seeing that they received an endowment, did not see why also the catholics should not. On Monday the scene was repeated, although on a smaller scale. The number of petitions on that evening was 679, chiefly from dissenters. Sir R. Peel had again the honour of presenting one petition from the presbyterian chapel at Newington, in favour of the grant. It is expected that there will be fully eleven thousand petitions against the measure. The total number of petitions as yet presented is about 4,200, so that Sir R. Peel has yet to face the brunt of the storm. The additional labour caused at the post office by these bulky documents is immense.

THE ELECTORAL BODY AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES.—A declaration is being circulated among the electors of Reading, to the effect that they will not vote for any future candidate who favours the Maynooth grant. The approaching election for the representation of West Kent will be contested, in consequence of Lord Holmesdale having expressed

himself favourable to the endowment of Maynooth. A requisition to another candidate is in the course of signature in all parts of the division. A declaration has just been delivered to Colonel T. Wood, M.P. for Middlesex, signed by a large number of the clergy of the metropolis, expressing their strong opposition to the proposed grant. A respectable number of electors, worshiping at Eton chapel, St Marylebone, have adopted a memorial to Sir C. Napier, on the subject of Maynooth, declaring their hostility to all endowments for religious purposes, and their intention to oppose his return at the next general election, in consequence of his support of the measure. We trust the example will be generally followed by all electors who are interested in the struggle. Let every elector, who cares for the subject, individually write to his representatives in parliament. We know no more easy and quick method of making public opinion to tell upon the House.

THE METROPOLIS.

THE DEPUTIES OF THE THREE DENOMINATIONS held a meeting, on Wednesday last, at the King's Head tavern, Poultry—the first occasion on which the proceedings were of an open character. The spirit of the speakers was worthy of the occasion, and of the admirable resolutions, which will be found inserted in our advertising columns. J. R. Mills, Esq., occupied the chair; and Messrs Hankey, Griffin, Wire, Conder, J. C. Evans, Apsley Pellatt, Burnet, Hanbury, Ebenezer Clarke, Offor, and Stock, moved and seconded the various resolutions.

THE BAPTISTS.—The committee of the Baptist Union have addressed a circular letter to all the congregations of that denomination, communicating the resolutions they adopted on the 26th ult.; stating that it is the intention of the committee to follow up these resolutions with petitions to both houses of parliament, and inclosing a form of petition for general guidance, together with some practical hints. The form of petition states:—

"That the petitioners regard with extreme repugnance the proposition to endow the Roman catholic seminary at Maynooth out of the resources of the state; that they strenuously object to the application of the public money to ecclesiastical purposes of every kind; and that they, therefore, pray parliament not to sanction a measure which would materially aggravate an evil already existing to so painful a degree."

BOROUGHS OF SOUTHWARK AND LAMBETH.—We are glad to find that an active committee has been formed for conducting, on dissenting principles, an opposition to the Maynooth Endowment bill, in the above boroughs. The committee has commenced in earnest; a circular has been sent to the whole of the ministers in the district, urging the immediate presentation of congregational petitions; also a circular to Sunday school teachers, calling upon them to join in the movement. Deputations from the committee, consisting of electors, have waited upon the representatives to explain the views entertained by dissenters on the bill, and respectfully to request their aid in defeating so obnoxious a measure. Public meetings will be immediately called for the purpose of arousing still more all classes of protestants, but especially of dissenters, to a resolute and most determined opposition to this infamous attempt to create a new church establishment in Ireland. The first meeting was held, on Monday night, at the Borough Road chapel, Southwark.

CITY OF LONDON.—A meeting was held, on Wednesday evening, at the Guildhall coffee-house, for the purpose of affording every opportunity to the young men of the metropolis of opposing the obnoxious Maynooth Grant bill. We noticed almost all the gentlemen as present who so vigorously opposed the late Factory bill. T. H. Fry, Esq., having taken the chair, resolutions were unanimously agreed upon, strongly deprecating the proposed measure, upon the grounds of the injury done to religion by state endowments of any kind; the injustice and immorality of the measure, as tending to render the catholic priesthood subservient to the government, and obstructive to the social and political advancement of the people. A petition, embodying these views, was signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting, and a deputation appointed to wait upon Mr Pattison, M.P. for the city of London, and urge his strenuous opposition to the measure. An executive committee was appointed to consider the most effectual means for promoting the objects of the meeting, and a liberal subscription made to meet the expenses of the movement. A vote of thanks having been presented to the chairman, the meeting separated. The young men have the credit of the first organised opposition to the bill on the part of the city of London. It will be seen, from an advertisement elsewhere, that the committee are actively at work.

EAST LONDON AUXILIARY TO THE SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.—At a meeting of the committee and representatives of the above auxiliary on Wednesday evening, a petition against the Maynooth grant was adopted and signed by the officers; and it was agreed to recommend the schools in the vicinity to lose no time in petitioning against the measure.

SOUTHWARK.—The Sunday school teachers are stirring themselves: they have determined to petition immediately against the Maynooth Endowment bill. A large number of petitions will be forthwith signed by the teachers and friends of the several schools in Southwark. We hope their example will be followed throughout the kingdom; and that at once. There must be no hesitation, no delay!

GREAT CITY MEETING.—On Monday morning a public meeting of the citizens of London was held at the London tavern, Bishopsgate street, in compliance with a requisition addressed to the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor, signed by upwards of 100 of the merchants, bankers, and traders of the City, requesting his lordship to call a meeting of those who were

opposed to the endowment out of the national treasury of the Roman catholic college of Maynooth, for the purpose of petitioning the legislature against that measure. Some time before the business commenced the large room of the tavern was completely filled, and although the meeting was a public one, and no tickets were required to procure admission, and notwithstanding the height to which party feeling at present runs, the proceedings were of the most orderly description, and no serious interruption took place in the course of them. The principal speakers were Mr J. Labouchere, Mr J. Cummins, Mr Moore, Mr D. W. Harvey, Dr Bunting, Mr Farmer, &c. With one exception, the speeches were of a "no popery" character. That exception was the address of Mr D. W. Harvey, who showed that he was still faithful to the principles he has always professed. Here are the grounds of his opposition:—

He opposed this measure, not upon the grounds that had been urged by the preceding speakers, not because he believed that it belonged to any class of men to arrogate to themselves the truth, denouncing every one who differed from them as heretics and schismatics; but he opposed it because he considered that religion was a principle far too sacred and unearthly to enter into any alliance with the state [cheers]. Opposed as he was to all endowments and to all establishments, his principal objection to this measure was, that it was the preliminary step towards an event which must be (and ought to be) realised if they were to have an established church at all in Ireland [cheers, and considerable dissatisfaction]. He objected to it also because it was unfair, for he should like to know whether the government would consent to endow the dissenters of this country; and he contended that they should either endow all or none [hear, hear].

He quoted, with admirable effect, the following extract from a speech of Sir R. Peel's, when Lord John Russell carried his appropriation clause:—

"The duty I have voluntarily assumed compels me to place before a triumphant conqueror the vanity of human wishes, and the instability of mortal triumphs, but yet I must not shrink from it; and I tell you that, notwithstanding your vaunted majorities, you do not control public opinion. Yes, there is a public opinion which exists independently of elective franchises, which votes cannot inspire, which majorities cannot control, but which is an essential instrument of executive government" [cheers and great laughter]. Let it not be said, then, that he, cherishing old animosities, was opposing Sir R. Peel's government. No—he came there in the spirit of that admonition to assert the sovereignty of the people—to oppose every measure which offended the feelings of their hearts, or committed an act of plunder upon their pockets [cheers]. It is observable that the truths Mr Harvey uttered relative to the protestant church of Ireland created so much confusion as, for a time, to suspend the proceedings of the meeting. One of the resolutions complained of the unprecedented attempt now making to force through parliament, with unusual haste, a measure including a grant of the public money, in spite of the deep repugnance so strongly manifested by all classes, degrees, and denominations of the British people."

AGGREGATE MEETING AT COVENT GARDEN THEATRE.—A united meeting of protestants, of all denominations, to protest against the establishment of popery, was held on Monday evening, in Covent Garden theatre. Before the appointed hour of meeting, the theatre was densely crowded in every part, not excepting the stage, which was occupied almost exclusively by gentlemen. The ladies present on this occasion formed comparatively but a small portion of the assembly, than which, we have seldom witnessed a more crowded one within the walls of Covent Garden theatre. The tone of the meeting was of a very determined character, and a highly encouraging indication of their appreciation of great principles. The attacks upon the Roman catholics indulged in by many of the speakers were little responded to by the audience, in comparison with those sentiments which pointed to the doing away of all endowments. For example, the chairman (Mr R. C. L. Bevan, of the firm of Barclay, Bevan, and Co.) thus elicited the general feeling of the meeting:—

Some hon. members thought that no religion should be endowed [cheers and waving of hats from a large portion of the auditory in the pit and galleries, followed by hisses from another portion]. Every gentleman had a right to hold his own opinions—but the opinion he had just referred to was not the ground on which they had met that evening [cheers and hisses]. It might be a ground, but it was not the ground—otherwise they could not have united as they were for a common object. Other hon. members said, that if there was to be an endowment it should be for their own religion [cries of "No"]. Other hon. members thought that all religions ought to be endowed [cries of "No," "Not at all," &c., &c.]. The principal speakers were, Dr C. O. (who made a most bitter attack upon Roman catholics, and even upon catholic emancipation), Messrs Blackburn and Sherman, independent ministers (who both asserted the voluntary principle), Mr Chalmers, of the Free church; Mr Dixon, of the Wesleyans; Sir C. E. Smith, Mr Blackburn, and Mr Scales, of Leeds. Mr Blackburn said—

He was neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but he thought he could foretell that this bill would never pass into a law. As had been said before, so he said now, "Thank God there is a House of Lords!" but even if the measure was not withheld there, he believed that their beloved Sovereign, whose throne was founded in righteousness, would interfere on their behalf, and require from her ministers the abandonment of a measure destructive to that protestantism with which the glory of her crown and the loyalty of her people were so closely associated [cheers]. The last resolution was to the following effect:—

"That in the event of the Maynooth bill passing the second reading, this meeting will re-assemble, in order to take into consideration the duty of protestant electors at the next general election; that the Central Anti-Maynooth committee convene such meeting as

speedily as possible, and that in the mean time they take such preparatory steps as they may deem advisable." The injury the present government is likely to sustain by bringing forward the present measure, may be judged of from a remark of the Chairman. "He had supported the cause of the present government with his exertions and his money, because he thought he was supporting the cause of religion; but he had found out his mistake [laughter]. They might laugh if they pleased, but he would never do it again [cheers and laughter]."

COMFORT FOR PEEL.—The English prelates of the Roman catholic church, to the number of ten or eleven, at present in London, on Friday forwarded to Sir Robert Peel their united thanks for his conduct on the Maynooth grant. A meeting of English catholics was to be held yesterday to petition in favour of the grant.

ENDOWMENT OF MAYNOOTH.—Meetings of members of the established church, and of the numerous bodies of dissenters of all denominations, are announced to be held in almost every parish and district in the metropolis on this subject, and to present petitions to the House of Commons against the grant.—*Times*.

MEETING AT HACKNEY.—On Friday evening a numerous and respectable meeting of the members and friends of the British Anti-state-church Association was held in the large assembly room, in Hackney, for the purpose of considering the Maynooth College Endowment bill. The chair was taken at seven o'clock, by S. D'Arcy Irvine, Esq., who opened the proceedings in a brief but impressive speech. The principal speakers were Mr E. Clarke, Mr Hare, and Messrs Katterns, Carlile, and Woodward, ministers. Mr Hare urged constituents to ply their representatives with letters. He could imagine the tenor of some of those useful missives to be as follows:—

"Dear Doctor—Are you not a member of the Council of the Anti-state-church Association [hear, hear]? How comes it, then, that you are for inflicting upon us an additional state-church? We do not understand such antics. This is a bolus which the Bolton people can't bolt [laughter]; but you, unless you change your mind, may bolt as soon as you like [cheers]. Yours, &c." A third may, not improbably, be couched in terms like these:—"Dear C.—We are at a loss to understand how it is that you think free trade a better thing in corn and cotton than in religion. Why not leave Ireland to grow its own priests [laughter]? Are you not afraid that the forcing system may occasion a glut? If we grow more priests than there is a market for, shall we not have to keep them [hear]? Is this good economy? Had we not better leave the article to be regulated by the natural law of supply and demand? But a word to the wise is enough" [hear, hear].

One of the resolutions was to the following effect:—

"That, in pledging itself to oppose, by all constitutional means, the endowment of Maynooth college, this meeting desire to assure their Roman catholic fellow-subjects of their earnest wish that, as citizens, they should fully share in all the civil rights enjoyed by other classes of the community; and their earnest hope that, by the entire withdrawal of the grant called *Regium Donum*, and the legal abolition of state churches, they may be freed from their ecclesiastical burdens, under which they, in common with protestant nonconformists, labour; and that a petition, founded on these resolutions, be adopted by this meeting, and, when signed, be presented to the House of Commons by James Pattison, Esq., M.P.; and that the members for the borough of the Tower Hamlets be requested to support its prayer: with an assurance, that those of the present meeting who are parliamentary electors, cannot engage, in future elections, to vote for any candidates who will not oppose the present obnoxious measure."

THE PROVINCES.

BRADFORD, YORKSHIRE.—There is a strong feeling against the grant to Maynooth in this district, and still it grows in strength. Petitions against it were laid for signature at all the Wesleyan chapels in the neighbourhood last Sunday; Dudley Hill, and Woodland Hills, in the Eastbrook circuit; and Kirkgate, White Abbey, and Centenary chapels, in the Bradford west circuit. The independent chapels in the town have either got up and despatched their petitions, or are preparing to do so. The baptists are also moving. At the parish church, and we believe at all the other churches in the borough, petitions have been numerously signed against the measure. A memorial is in course of signature to the Hon. Stuart Wortley, M.P. for the West Riding, and to William Busfield, Esq., M.P. for this borough, respectively. Mr Busfield's support of the measure in parliament had excited the surprise and regret of some of his best friends.—*Bradford Observer*.

PONTEFRACT.—At a meeting of the corporation, clergy, and ministers of the different protestant denominations, and other principal inhabitants of the borough of Pontefract, held at the Town hall, on Thursday morning, April 10th, 1845, a declaration in opposition to the Premier's bill for the endowment of Maynooth College was agreed upon, and signed by the gentlemen present, declaring their firm determination that, in case the said bill shall pass into a law, they will, at the next general election, in their various spheres of influence, oppose every candidate who shall either have supported the said bill in its future stages through parliament, or who will not express his determination to vote for the repeal of it at the earliest possible opportunity. This declaration is in progress of being numerously signed, both by borough and county voters, in the town and neighbourhood.

WESLEYAN PETITIONS.—All the Wesleyan congregations in Leeds, and we believe in Yorkshire and in the kingdom, last Sunday signed petitions against the Maynooth grant.—*Leeds Mercury*.

HUDDERSFIELD.—The Huddersfield petition against the government grant to the college of Maynooth,

was forwarded on Wednesday to the Hon. J. S. Wortley, M.P., for presentation, being signed by the vicar, the whole of the church clergy, and most of the dissenting ministers in the town and neighbourhood, and contained altogether about 800 names.

BIRMINGHAM.—A spirited public meeting of the congregation of Bond Street chapel, was held on Tuesday evening, to oppose this grant on the ground of opposition to all endowments for religious purposes. A more general public meeting is to be held this week, at which the clergy and dissenting ministers are expected unitedly to assist.

PUBLIC MEETING AT LEICESTER.—On Tuesday evening, a numerous, spirited, and influential meeting of the evangelical dissenters of Leicester was held in the New hall—H. F. Coleman, Esq., of Evington hall, in the chair—for the purpose of giving a most decided opposition to the proposed measure, and to all state grants and endowments for religious purposes. Messrs J. Smedmore, J. Green, J. P. Mursell, J. Bloodworth, G. Legge, A.M., J. Davis, of Arnesby, and T. Mays, of Wigston, ministers of the gospel, Alderman Cripps, Mr Winks, Mr J. Collier, and Mr Day (a catholic), took part in the proceedings, which occupied three hours. The inconsistency of Lord John Russell and the whigs, in professing an attachment to religious liberty and supporting this fresh violation of its spirit, was strongly commented on by more than one speaker. Resolutions based upon the integrity of the voluntary principle were adopted, with but one or two dissentients; a petition grounded upon them was signed by the Chairman, and congregational petitions throughout the county were recommended. On Wednesday a petition was hastily got up, and forwarded, for the postponement of the second reading.

DEVONSHIRE.—In this county the proposed grant to Maynooth has excited a vigorous opposition, in which the dissenters have taken the lead, on the only just principle that no one class of religious professors ought to be endowed by the state. This principle was eloquently enforced at a crowded meeting of the dissenters of Exeter, on Friday night, by Dr Payne, Dr Dobbin, Messrs Hellings (who presided) Bigwood, Welch, and other ministers and gentlemen. Resolutions and a petition were unanimously adopted. Dr Dobbin, in the course of his speech, said:—

He asked for a clear field and no favour, and it would not require great ability to bring down the wide-spreading branches of the great upas, and all the crows roosting above would soon be dislodged and ejected. This was the wisest, the manliest, best way—to go at once to the root. Never mind the petty larcenies of church rates, of tithes, of Easter offerings, of *regium donum*, and all other grants—all these thievish tricks were as nothing in comparison with the great principle.

At a public meeting of dissenters, held at the Mechanics' Institute, Plymouth, on Monday week, much the same course of proceedings was adopted; and a Wesleyan minister was strongly censured for the manner in which he spoke of the Roman catholics. On the following day the dissenters of Barnstaple held a public meeting on the same subject. Three petitions have been sent from this town. "At Totnes," says the *Western Times*, "the independents have sent a congregational petition against the measure, signed by about 500 persons, as also a petition from the teachers of the Sabbath school. On Tuesday evening a handbill appeared, exhorting all parties to unite in a petition from the town. The result has been, that a borough petition has been forwarded to London, with nearly 1,000 signatures, from protestants of every shade of politics and religious profession; congregational petitions have also been numerously subscribed by the dissenting communities at Morley, Stoke Gabriel, Harburtonford, and various other places in the neighbourhood." A petition to the following effect was adopted at the annual meeting of the Sunday School Union at Plymouth, held on Friday evening, in Norley Street chapel:—

"That your petitioners deem the interference of the government in religious matters directly opposed to the word of God, the liberty of conscience, and prejudicial to the true welfare of the state; and, therefore, decidedly object to the proposed grant to the college of Maynooth."

THE CHURCH PARTY have been holding meetings in various parts of the country during the past week, but they have all partaken of the same character. Unmitigated abuse of popery, mingled with attacks on Sir R. Peel, has been the staple of the speeches. The clergy of Bath and Northampton, and the Herts Reformation and Protestant association (attended by Mr Bickersteth and Dr Harris) have protested against the measure. A petition against the grant to Maynooth college has been signed by the archdeacon of Buckingham and seventy-nine clergymen. That to the House of Lords will be presented by the Duke of Buckingham, who, it is understood, will support the prayer of it.

OXFORD.—The dissenters of this city held a public meeting last week to oppose the Maynooth grant; G. Davenport, Esq., in the chair. The *Oxford Chronicle* says:—"It was gratifying to hear all the speakers disclaim so strongly any unfriendly feeling towards the Roman catholics, and to observe the unanimity with which their right to the full enjoyment of civil and religious freedom was recognised. The meeting was crowded, and, by the frequent bursts of feeling manifested, gave strong indications of the deep interest which was taken in the proceedings, and the concurrence of the large assembly in the statements and views of the several speakers."

Meetings, at which churchmen and dissenters have united in their opposition to the Premier's measure, have been held at Devizes and Windsor.

LANCASHIRE.—Petitions and memorials, says the *Manchester Times*, have been sent from almost every independent chapel in Manchester and Salford, in Bury, Rochdale, Stockport, Bolton, Ashton, and

Oldham, praying, not in the spirit of persecuting intolerance, but of honest and enlightened patriotism, against the passing of the bill. The congregationalists of Lancashire have, by their delegates, argued the question a little more polemically. We perceive that the congregations of the same body meet in Grosvenor Street chapel next Tuesday evening, and we think it probable this course may be followed by the proximate towns. The members for these boroughs will have their eyes directed to such proceedings. The people will not wait for Mr Ward's motion. They will judge from the vote on Sir Robert Peel's bill. The *Manchester Times* contains a circular letter from Dr Massie, as secretary to the dissenters' committee in that town for opposing the Maynooth Endowment bill, earnestly recommending that, although the friends in Lancashire may have already petitioned against the ministerial proposition, their ministers will immediately urge their congregations and schools each to join in a similar prayer against the passing of the bill. The same journal contains the petition adopted on Thursday, and signed by the greater number of ministers and delegates who attended the Union of the congregationalists for the county of Lancaster, at Grosvenor Street chapel, Piccadilly:—

The petitioners "object to any religious endowment from the revenues of the state, as unjust to themselves, unnecessary for true religion, and only a political expedient, while the consciences of many are offended, and the resources of all classes are taxed for the exclusive benefit, not of a religious people, but a stipendiary priesthood—a palpable moral and political injustice; and they regard the principle as equally iniquitous, whether the Roman catholic be thus taxed for the maintenance of protestantism, or protestants for the maintenance of popery, or any one section of worshipers for the maintenance of the worship or creed of another."

A public meeting was to be held last night at Grosvenor Street chapel.—On Monday morning last a preparatory meeting, formed of deputations from the various dissenting chapels in the town, was held in Newington chapel, Renshaw street, to take into consideration the best means to be adopted to oppose the grant to Maynooth college, on the principle that the state should not support any religious establishment. Thomas Blackburn, Esq., in the chair. Resolutions to the above effect were read, and a committee formed to carry out the object of the deputations, and call a public meeting during the ensuing week.—*Liverpool Mercury*.—The Liverpool petition has received 15,000 signatures. On Friday a public meeting of dissenters was held at Preston, to protest against the proposed grant to Maynooth, on their own distinctive principles.

IN LEEDS, a public meeting of the protestant congregations was to be held last evening, in the East Parade chapel. Let all the towns in Yorkshire and Lancashire, which have not already held public meetings, take the same course. Nearly every protestant dissenting congregation in Leeds has sent up its petition; but the church party has not yet spoken out. The indecent haste with which Sir Robert Peel is pressing the Maynooth bill through parliament, has prevented many of those manifestations of public feeling against the bill that would otherwise have taken place. The ministers and office-bearers of the dissenting bodies in Leeds have done their part to endeavour to check this indecent haste, by signing a memorial to Sir Robert Peel, requesting delay, which was sent off on Thursday night by a deputation, at the head of whom was Mr Thomas Scales, independent minister.

NEWCASTLE.—The committee of the Newcastle and Gateshead Religious Freedom Society, have transmitted to Mr Ord, M.P., a petition to the House of Commons, showing—

"That it is one of the 'fundamental principles' of the Society of which your petitioners are the committee, 'That to compel any one to contribute to the support of religious institutes of which he disapproves, or of the ministers of a church from which he conscientiously dissent, is manifestly unjust, and at variance with the spirit and principles of Christianity.'

"That your petitioners are, therefore, opposed to the *regium donum*, the Maynooth grant, and all kindred payments from the public purse, and are desirous that all of them should be wholly and for ever withdrawn.

"That, such being their principles and wishes, they have heard with sorrow and dissatisfaction of the proposal to enlarge the annual grant to the college of Maynooth, and to make it perpetual.

"That your petitioners are prompted by no invidious or bigoted hostility to their Roman catholic fellow subjects, but would gladly see them, and all other churches and citizens, in the full and perfect enjoyment of civil and religious liberty—a consummation which can never be realised, until the state churches of the three kingdoms are abolished.

"That your petitioners are not actuated, either, by an unfriendly feeling to the cause of education; but, instead of endowing a Roman catholic or any other denominational college, they would throw open the national universities to their countrymen of all religious persuasions.

"That, university tests being abolished, your petitioners would leave every separate church to provide, at its own expense, its peculiar system of religious education.

"That your petitioners, therefore, pray your hon. House not to pass the Maynooth Education bill, but to withdraw the Maynooth grant, the *regium donum*, and all similar payments from the public purse."

The petitioners have also convened a public meeting, to be held in Newcastle on Tuesday next, with a view to a more general petition to parliament.—*Gateshead Observer*. [The same journal publishes a correspondence between Mr Hutt, the member for the borough, and Mr Speck, on behalf of thirty-nine electors, who requested him to assist in rejecting a measure so opposed to protestantism. Mr Hutt replies—"The cause of religion, the cause of all civil and social institutions, may, indeed I think they must, suffer from the ignorance of the spiritual instructors of a whole people; but I cannot believe

that any great or good purpose will be promoted by refusing them the means of adequate mental cultivation. I cannot, therefore, as an honest man, decline to support the government measure for increasing the educational advantages of Maynooth.]

SOUTH SHIELDS.—A stormy scene took place on Wednesday last at a public meeting to oppose the Maynooth grant, in the Wesleyan chapel of this town. The first and second resolutions having been spoken to and put, Mr J. W. Miatt rose in the body of the chapel, and stated he was one of the requisitionists, and that he was anxious to go to parliament on a broader principle than mere opposition to Romanism. He stated that this grant was another instance of the pernicious influence of state patronage of religion, and the dangerous effects of the union of church and state. At the mention of church all state the chairman rose, and said he would not have that question discussed there. It was contrary to the constitution of methodism to have these subjects treated in their chapels, and if Mr Miatt determined to press the subject he must dissolve the meeting. Before Mr Miatt sat down, he moved, as an amendment, that the petition should be at once read. Dr Williamson seconded the amendment, and stated that he, as a requisitionist, must protest against a petition going to parliament based on statements calumniating his Roman catholic fellow-citizens. The chairman refused to put the amendment. Resolutions were proposed by Messrs Lamb, J. P. Elliott, Rev. J. Storey, H. Lawson, and Mr A. Harrison, which were carried; counter-resolutions were proposed by Mr Joseph W. Miatt and Dr Williamson, which the chairman refused to put. During these proceedings the meeting was in the greatest confusion, one party cheering and the other hissing. Sir R. Peel's bill is opposed on different grounds by different parties, and we are afraid Wesleyans, churchmen, and dissenters cannot meet together on one platform in their opposition. — *Sunderland Herald.*

NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK.—In Norfolk the dissenters are actively engaged in agitating against the Maynooth grant, under the vigorous leadership of Messrs Reed and Brock, ministers. Meetings have been held at St Mary's chapel, Norwich, presided over by Thomas Geldart, Esq., Ingham, and Yarmouth, at which petitions to parliament were adopted, and resolutions passed for memorialising their M.P.'s, and, if necessary, the throne itself. The *Norfolk News*, which devotes no small portion of its space to the reports of these meetings, contains the following paragraph:—"The following document has been despatched to the liberal member for the city, after receiving upwards of one hundred signatures in the course of a few hours:—

"To Benjamin Smith, Esq., M.P.

"SIR—We, the undersigned electors of the city of Norwich, respectfully but most earnestly request you, as our representative in parliament, to oppose the government measure for the endowment of the Roman catholic college at Maynooth.

"We look upon this proposal with such fearful apprehension, that we cannot conscientiously support any candidate at a future election, whose vote has been recorded in favour of that which, in our opinion, interferes with the rights of our conscience, and violates the principles of religious liberty."

This day a town's meeting, convened by the Mayor, is to be held in the Town hall, Ipswich. At a meeting of ministers and representatives of the congregations assembling at Tacket street, Stoke Green, Nicholas chapel, and Turret Green, Ipswich, to consider propriety of petitioning against the proposed endowment of the Roman catholic college of Maynooth, held on Thursday, the 20th of March, in Tacket street vestry the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

"That the proposed increase of the grant to the college of Maynooth renders it desirable that petitions should be sent to the legislature against the application of the funds of the state, to the endowment of any religious party."

A petition in conformity with the principle avowed in this resolution, has been prepared, signed, and transmitted for presentation to the House of Commons, to T. M. Gibson, Esq., M.P., with the particular request that he would call the attention of the House to the specific ground of opposition to the grant.

SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH.—On Tuesday, a public meeting of the protestant inhabitants of Edinburgh, favourable to petitioning the legislature against the proposed endowment of Maynooth, was held in the Waterloo rooms; Baillie Duncan in the chair. Among the company present were Sir James Forrest; James Nairne, Esq., of Dunsinane; G. M. Torrance, Esq., of Threave; Baillie Gray; Councillors Lothian, Ritchie, and James Duncan; Drs Purdie, Begbie, Macaulay, Beilby, and Smyttan; Drs Gordon, Duncan, and Candlish; Messrs Guthrie, Begg, Tweedie, Gregory, Davidson, Goold, Wallace, Manson, A. Thomson, J. R. Campbell, A. W. Brown, Johnston, Innes, Arthur, &c. The meeting was addressed by Mr Beggs and Dr Candlish, ministers of the Free church of Scotland; Mr Campbell and Mr Robertson, independent ministers; and other gentlemen. Most of the speakers denounced the measure on theological grounds. The resolutions were so worded as to leave the question of state endowments an open question. The speech of Dr Candlish was particularly energetic. He made the following declaration in reference to the voluntary principle:—

It is not our fault if the proposal to endow popery shall force us seriously and solemnly to consider what is our duty, not in reference to maintaining the principle of national establishments, but what is our duty in reference to all the institutions that shall then be endowed; and, reserving the carrying out of that great scriptural principle which we maintain till better times, we may be

forced into a position in which we shall see wholesale endowment of that which is contrary to scripture; and thus find ourselves ready to say, "Rather let all that is true in religion be left to shift for itself—in sole dependence upon Him who is the truth and the life, than that, under the pretence that the endowing of one sect entitles wholesale endowment." [cheers].

On the question before them, he said—

I shall be ready and right willing to enter, with tenfold more energy, along with any of my brethren, on the task of arousing and agitating the community to a sense of its duty and heavy responsibility [vehement and protracted cheering]. *Delenda est Carthago* must henceforth be our motto [renewed cheering]. Let everything else give place to this question [hear, hear]. Shall we send men to parliament who are determined to continue their support to this measure? or shall we return men as our representatives who shall root it up—who shall not rest until it has been swept from the statute book, which it can only stain and dishonour? [loud cheers.]

Mr W. Innes proposed, as an amendment—

"That the proposal of the government to endow Maynooth is condemned by this meeting, on the ground that it could only be accomplished by a gross misappropriation of the public money; that it is unwarranted by scripture, opposed to justice, and detrimental to the interests of the community; and that, in the present instance, the enormity of the measure is greatly aggravated by the fact, which it is not attempted to conceal, that the grant is intended to render permanent the Irish protestant establishment, by bribing those who, from their position, are at present among its most active assailants."

He said that the opposition of the voluntaries, to be effective, must be based on their distinctive principles. How can their enthusiasm and energies be evoked, unless their principles be fully and unequivocally enunciated? Upon what ground are they to combat, unless upon their own chosen battle field? The gentleman who moved the resolution said, it behoved all, in the present juncture, to be at their posts. Is the post of the voluntaries upon Free church territory? if not, where, in the resolution, is their peculiar and distinct position to be found? [cheers and hisses.] Mr Musket, draper, seconded the resolution. He could see, for instance, how members of the Free church and voluntaries—how even members of the established church, and protestants of all classes—might unite to battle against popery, by joining together and getting up a course of lectures, or by writing against that unscriptural system; but for those who were opposed to all endowments, for those who protest against the public funds being appropriated to any sect whatever, joining and going to Parliament with those who supported grants to Protestants and opposed them to Roman catholics, was to his mind quite incongruous. Dr Candlish said it was not properly a question between those who approved of the voluntary principle and those who held the establishment principle, but it was a question between those who thought it was impossible for the two parties to unite, and those who thought it was possible. Dr Marshall, secession minister of Leith, said he had come to the meeting not prepared either to vote for or against the amendment proposed. He had come with a view to be instructed as to the ground on which it might be possible for voluntaries and free churchmen to unite in opposing this grant. If they could unite—if they could go forward in one phalanx—they would have an influence which separately they could not possess; and therefore, *prima facie*, he was persuaded that union was better than disunion. After mentioning that he wished Dr Candlish had been more explicit in his statement, he concluded by saying that he dissented from the motion, on the ground that it objected to the grant because it was given to the Roman catholics. After a few observations from Mr Robertson, the chairman took the sense of the meeting on the amendment, when only a few hands were held up in its favour, upon which the resolution was agreed to amidst loud acclamation.

At a meeting of the church and congregation assembling in Argyle square, Edinburgh, Mr W. Henderson in the chair, a petition to parliament against the grant was unanimously adopted.

It will be observed that another public meeting is to be held on the evening of Thursday next, in South College Street church, against the proposed grant of public money to the college at Maynooth. Such a meeting in this city is certainly called for, not merely on account of the pernicious nature of the grant itself, but to afford the inhabitants generally a more convenient opportunity of expressing their opposition to this measure, and of assailing it on the only rational and consistent ground—that of condemning all state endowments to any religious denomination whatever. Several well-known speakers are to take part in the proceedings, and we cannot doubt that there will be a crowded attendance.—*Edinburgh Chronicle.*

GREENOCK.—On Thursday evening last, a public meeting of the inhabitants of this town was held in the Relief church, for the purpose of considering the propriety of adopting resolutions and petitioning parliament against the proposal to increase the grant of the public money to Maynooth college. About 2,000 persons were present, chiefly belonging to the dissenting and Free churches in town. Mr W. Auld, minister, presided. Messrs Finlayson and Sinclair, ministers, and Messrs Thorn, M'Ilvain, and Clark, were the principal speakers. The resolutions and petition condemned all state churches, and the meeting passed a vote of thanks to Mr Wallace, their late member.

PUBLIC MEETING AT ST ANDREW'S.—A public meeting of such of the inhabitants of St Andrew's as were opposed to any additional grant of endowment being made to the Roman catholic college of Maynooth, was held on Monday evening, the 7th inst., in the town hall of that city, for the purpose of petitioning against the measure. Sir David Brewster was

called to the chair. The speeches and resolutions were of the usual "no popery" complexion. Mr Henderson moved, in the shape of an amendment, a petition condemning all endowments, but finally withdrew it on a point of form.

THE UNITED SECESSION PRESBYTERY of Glasgow, representing forty congregations, have adopted a petition against the grant to Maynooth, in which they object to all state support by the legal endowment of any body of professed Christians, being convinced that Christian institutions ought to be left to the voluntary support of Christians themselves, as in the primitive age of the gospel. The presbytery of Edinburgh (establishment) and the synod of Fife have also petitioned against the grant, but not without dissentients in both cases.

SIR ROBERT PEEL'S BILL FOR INCREASING THE GRANT.—The following is an abstract of the measure read a first time on Thursday night last. It is entitled, "A bill to amend two acts passed in Ireland for the better education of persons professing the Roman catholic religion, and for the better government of the college established at Maynooth for the education of such persons; and also an act passed in the parliament of the United Kingdom for amending the said two acts." The preamble of this weighty measure occupies full two pages. The first clause enacts, that the trustees of the college or seminary of Maynooth, and their successors for ever, shall be one body politic and corporate by the name of "The Trustees of the College of Maynooth," and by that name shall have perpetual succession and a common seal, and by that name shall and may sue and be sued, and shall have and possess the several powers and authorities vested in the said trustees under the recited acts. Such corporate body is empowered to take and possess any personal property, and also lands, tenements, or hereditaments not exceeding the annual value of £3,000, exclusive of the property already acquired by the trustees. The lands, &c., now possessed by the trustees of Maynooth college, to vest in the said body politic and corporate. Provision is made, by clause 4, for the payment of an annual sum (not exceeding in the whole the sum of £6,000) for the salaries of the president, vice-president, and other officers and professors of the said college, and the increase thereof. Provision is also made for the senior students on the Dunboyne establishment; for 500 free students (250 in the three senior, and 250 in the four junior classes) on the establishment, in addition to the scholars already maintained and educated out of the annual parliamentary grant hitherto made to the college; and for the expense of commons, and other necessaries, not to exceed the annual sum of £28 for each such student. The commissioners of public works are to act as commissioners for the repairs of Maynooth college, and for the erection and furnishing of additional buildings, &c. These commissioners are empowered, by the ninth clause of the bill, to purchase and provide the necessary lands, buildings, &c. The tenth and eleventh clauses (which are printed in italics, as proposed for insertion in a committee of the whole House) contain the most important provisions, in a pecuniary sense. The tenth enacts that all and every the expense of purchasing or providing the houses, buildings, lands, tenements, or hereditaments, necessary for the said college under the provisions of this act, and of erecting the necessary buildings for the same, and of putting the said college into repair, and of fitting up and of furnishing the same, and the buildings so to be erected, not exceeding in the whole the sum of £30,000, shall be paid and discharged by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury out of the Consolidated fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The eleventh enacts that the several monies annually payable by this act shall be all charged on the Consolidated fund. The annual stipends of the twenty senior students on the Dunboyne establishment are fixed at £40 each, and those of the 250 free students in the three senior classes at £20 each. The next clause repeals so much of the existing acts of parliament as enacts that the Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, the Lords Chief Justices of the courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the lord chief baron, shall have visitatorial power over the academy or college of Maynooth. Henceforward the other visitors in being at the time of the passing of the act, &c., together with such other five persons as her Majesty shall, by warrant under the sign manual, from time to time nominate and appoint, will be the visitors of the said college and corporation. The visitations to be held once a year, and additional visitations are to be held when ordered by his excellency the lord lieutenant of the kingdom. *The authority of the visitors is not to affect the exercise of the Romish religion, or the religious doctrine or discipline thereof within the walls of the said seminary;* and the 18th clause distinctly enacts that in all matters which relate to the exercise, doctrine, or discipline of the Roman catholic religion, the visitatorial power over the said college shall be exercised exclusively by such of the said visitors of the Roman religion as have been elected under the provisions of the acts in force, in presence of the persons nominated by the Queen aforesaid. The minutes of the proceedings of the visitors are to be duly kept and reported to her Majesty from time to time. Such reports to be communicated to both houses of parliament within six weeks after the same shall be made. This bill contains altogether twenty clauses, and is to be read a second time on Friday next.

THE PRESS AND THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.

AYLESBURY NEWS.—It is pitiable to witness the extent of fanaticism and bigotry still existing in the country. Had the proposed grant been for any protes-

tant purposes, not a fourth of the opposition would have been got up even among the dissenters. The true ground of opposition is taken up but by few—and that we conceive to be the right of every man to that freedom of conscience which will not render it obligatory on him to pay for the dissemination of a religion he does not believe to be the true one.

BIRMINGHAM PILOT.—While we have no desire to interfere with Roman catholics or any other parties in any matter of religious worship, providing they do not seek to tax other people for that purpose; and while we feel no sympathy with motives of the "no popery" agitators, whose notions of religious justice are founded on a kind of reciprocity, in which the balance lies all on one side, they having no objection to mulcting the public, providing it be done in the name of a "protestant establishment" instead of a "catholic college," we hold the decided opinion that if the present bill is allowed to pass, an injury will be done to the cause of civil and religious liberty of which there is no calculating the extent.

HERTS REFORMER.—One thing we are certain of; Sir Robert Peel has done infinite damage to the establishment principle by his proceedings, and by his speech on introducing the measure. One would almost think that the elected champion of the church meant to deal with it as he has done with the monopolists.

WESTERN TIMES.—Even though the Irish church be saved at the expense of the general tax-payers, it can only be for a time. It is the existence of the church, as an establishment with nothing to do, that is the real grievance, and no paltry bribe of priest education will induce the Irish people to be satisfied with the oppressive nuisance.

SOMERSET GAZETTE.—There is a means by which order may be established and good feeling engendered more easily than by a dozen such remedies as the Premier proposes; it is the reduction of the Irish church establishment to a degree consistent with its reasonable wants, and the endowment of collegiate schools throughout Ireland, wherein persons of all religious persuasions may be educated.

LEEDS TIMES.—We need scarcely repeat the opinion which we hold of this insidious measure. We regard it as a bribe to the catholic priesthood, to draw them off from the repeal agitation. It is couched in no loving spirit towards Ireland; but the reverse. Its object is to make the Irish catholic church a great police establishment, in the pay of the English government.

BRIGHTON GUARDIAN.—It is no justification of endowing the Irish Roman catholic priesthood that the English episcopal priesthood is already endowed. It is no justification of a measure which takes money from the industrious people to educate a race of wily catholic priests, that money is already taken from the people to educate wily protestant priests. The plain fact is, that there is already a vast deal too large a portion of the national produce directed by the state to the sustenance of priesthood; and this proposition directs an additional sum of about £20,000 a year to the same mischievous end.

NORFOLK NEWS.—These things will open the eyes of the middle classes, and of the nonconformists especially, to the inadequacy of the present system of representation, and they will awake as from a dream from their long indifference to the subject. At the same time, the religious men of all parties, who are united in their opposition to the grant to Maynooth, will be driven to a greater union in their opinion about church establishments. Those who opposed state-churchism before, will oppose it more strongly now that they find it involves the endowment of popery; and those who advocated the connexion between church and state, will come to suspect the justice of their opinion on the same account.

SUFFOLK CHRONICLE.—Nonconformists might have laboured for years unsuccessfully in endeavouring to promulgate their opinions that a state church was a national evil. Men who profit by things as they are, are loath to be convinced, and are seldom converted if convinced; but the government has all at once made the matter palpable, and dealt a blow which sceptics themselves cannot withstand.

HANTS INDEPENDENT.—We must own, that there is some reason to regret that a noble cause is encumbered with such discreditable allies; but the cause is not the less intrinsically just, although subjected to the calamity of being tarnished by the advocacy of bigots and blockheads. The maintenance of the great principle, "that no man should be taxed for the upholding of what he believes to be another man's error," is the object of our endeavours; and if some, from other motives than those which true religion and sound principles dictate, adopt a course leading, by a different road, to the same result for which we contend, we must only be the more plain in the announcement of our principles, but not less firm in maintaining them.

CHELTENHAM FREE PRESS.—There is now going on a great protestant opposition to this grant, and, for our own part, we feel indifferent whether it succeed or not. If it were based on the true ground of opposition to all religious endowments whatever, it should have our hearty concurrence and support; but we cannot consent to join a movement that, in the name of religion, excites feelings the reverse of Christian, and promotes all uncharitableness amongst persons holding different religious opinions.

SHEFFIELD INDEPENDENT.—We are glad to see that the friends of religious liberty generally, and especially the dissenters, have held themselves aloof from the demonstrations of the church party, and have expressed their sentiments in other ways. The question with them is not whether the Roman catholic church is a pure system of religion or a heresy. They hold that men are answerable to civil governments for conduct, and not for faith. . . . They say it is not for civil government to decide between religious truth and error; and that, for the government to select any sect or sects, and endow them at the expense of the community, is to go beyond the right province of government, and to commit injustice.

BRISTOL MERCURY.—The opposition to this grant, out of doors, has proceeded from two parties—from those who object to all government grants for religious purposes; and from those who do not object to such grants when they are themselves the recipients. The opposition of the former class is intelligible and consistent; the opposition of the latter class is also intelligible, but not quite so consistent.

INQUIRER.—The *Morning Chronicle* accuses the dissenters of England, who oppose the Maynooth grant on the voluntary principle, of ministering to the no-popery spirit, because they have not agitated against the *regium donum*, or against the protestant church of Ireland, but begin by attacking a small boon to the catholics. We answer that, of late (for it is only of late that their attention has been roused to the subject), that they have most earnestly protested against the *regium donum*, and they have formed a society, which will soon show itself to be a powerful one, for the purpose of opposing all connexion of religion with civil power, and of using every proper means for dissolving it. They are, therefore, perfectly consistent in opposing with all their energies an attempt at a further application of a principle which they entirely condemn.

EDINBURGH CHRONICLE.—If any religion ought to be endowed, so ought every one; for every religion has adherents who believe it to be true, and no man is entitled to judge for his neighbour in such matters. The sound—the only sound—principle on which the proposed measure can be resisted, is, opposition to ecclesiastical endowments from public funds; for protestants who hold it just to tax catholics for the support of protestantism, cannot justly or consistently deny the right of catholics to tax protestants for the support of popery.

GLASGOW POST.—Taking this view of the question, we call upon every denomination of dissenters—but we call upon no other—to petition against this grant, because churchmen who adhere to endowments have no right to do so. Dissenters should petition as citizens of the community in which they live; they should petition as congregations, and take care, also, at the same time, that their petitions are properly supported by powerful representations, and by deputations, if necessary—at all events by their representatives in the House of Commons.

GLASGOW EXAMINER.—The friends of liberty may also look on this grant as an exposure of the principle of establishments. The bestowment of it is in full keeping with the principle of these. The advocates of religious establishments cannot bring forward one argument of the least weight against it. The only wonder is, that catholics are so foolish as to accept it.

GREENOCK OBSERVER.—So much are people persuaded that the present grant is only a prelude to measures of much wider range, that not only is the endowment of the whole popish clergy of Ireland confidently predicted, but it is asserted that a similar boon will speedily be held out to the Free church in Scotland, and, some add, eagerly accepted. We shall not here venture to play the part of prophet; but if our Free church friends have any hankering after state pay, they may here see on account of what considerations, and with what aims, it has any chance of being offered to them.

BANNER OF ULSTER.—(Organ of the Irish Presbyterians).—We see clearly that the Roman catholic religion will be established in Ireland, and probably in England too, ere many years, unless all religious establishments are taken out of the way; and we **FEEL THAT EVANGELICAL PROTESTANTS MUST MAKE UP THEIR MINDS FOR THIS WORK.** In the diocese of Down and Connor, there could be little lost by evangelical protestantism from the change, and that change must come.

BRITISH ANTI-STATE-CHURCH ASSOCIATION.—Mr E. Miall (Editor of the *Nonconformist*), having notified his intention of giving a lecture on Thursday last at Sudbury, the Mayor (Geo. Andrews, Esq.) was applied to for the use of the Town-hall, and a written paper, containing the title of the lecture—"On the incompatibility of state churches with the rights of citizenship, with an allusion to the grant to the Roman catholic college of Maynooth," was at the same time given to him. With the urbanity which has uniformly characterised his conduct, he at once gave his assent to the request. Bills were printed and distributed in the town, but on Wednesday morning the Mayor apprised the gentleman to whom he had granted the use of the hall, that he must withdraw his consent, his excuse for this conduct being that "he had not understood for what purpose it had been applied for!"—*Suffolk Chronicle*.

DISTRAINT FOR CHURCH RATES.—Last week, the annual distraint for church rates was made on members of the society of Friends, in Strood, near Rochester; when goods, as under, were seized by Mr Robert Clark, collector; and as no respectable auctioneer could be found to sell them, they were sold, or appropriated, at a low public house, at prices much below their value, by the broker—the collector being himself a principal purchaser.

£ s. d.

Furniture taken—			
demand	1	3	4
T. Wheeler & Son,	4	10	0
ditto	3	6	6
T. & A. Hormail,	6	9	0
ditto	2	0	3
W. C. Hormail, do.	3	10	0
Maria Hormail, do.	9	11	4
Total demand	19	11	5
Seizure	38	2	0

During the last five years, there have been taken from these individuals, by similar process for the same object, property to the value of £210 14s. None of them are in affluent circumstances; one is a widow with a large family, and another has seen her room stripped *eleven times*, to satisfy the demands of the "poor man's church."

NUMBER OF MARRIAGES performed in churches of the establishment and in other places, since the passing of the present marriage act.

For the year ending	In churches	In other places.	Total	Proportion of Marriages out of churches.
30th June 1838	107,201	4280	111,481	1-26
1839	114,632	6451	121,083	1-19
1840	117,018	7311	124,329	1-17
1841	114,448	8034	122,482	1-15
1842	110,124	8687	118,881	1-13

From this table, it appears, that the nonconformists are increasingly availing themselves every year of the freedom from church domination. Although the total number of marriages have varied, having increased during the first three years, and decreased during the two last, yet there has been a steady increase, from the very commencement in the number

of marriages performed out of established churches: the number in the first year being 4,280, and in the last 8,687, or more than double; and whilst in the year 1838 the proportion of marriages in other places than established churches was one-twenty-sixth of the whole, in the year 1842 they were one-thirteenth. It is surprising that this number is not still greater than it actually is; for it cannot, at present, be considered as even an approximation to the proportions of the nonconformists to churchmen throughout the country. Doubtless, the strong prejudices which exist in favour of an old custom, which individuals are called upon to comply with generally but once in their lives, may account for the smallness of the number. But this practice of weak nonconformists, who, by forsaking their own altars for those of a church they profess to disown—thus practically proclaiming to the world distrust of their own principles, and who thus set their professions and their deeds at variance with each other, is strongly to be deprecated. The Wesleyan methodists are, I believe, the only body of nonconformists who systematically insult their own principles and their own preachers, by sending their members to the church to enter into the bands of matrimony. They baptise, and they administer the sacrament; but they are unequal to the marriage ceremony. How long will this anomaly exist?—*Correspondent*.

VOLUNTARISM IN THE CHURCH.—The authorities of the established church in Loughborough have this year set an example worthy of imitation by their brethren in other places. Instead of laying a rate for the purpose of raising means of defraying the expenses incurred by conducting divine worship in the Old church, they have tried the more honourable plan adopted by some of their dissenting neighbours—namely, public collections, which were made on Sunday week, after two sermons preached by the Revs J. H. Hamilton, of Sheephead, and W. Ackworth, of Rothley. The amount of the collections, including a few small donations, was upwards of £87.—*Leicester Mercury*.

THE CHURCH IN GERMANY.—The excitement throughout the north of Germany relative to the secession of sundry catholics from their allegiance to the church of Rome, and the establishment of a German catholic church, does not at all subside, and it is pretty currently believed to be secretly encouraged by certain governments. A subscription has been opened for funds wherewith to erect the newly required churches, and the list has been extended to Altona; but with what success does not appear.

Correspondence.

THE TRUE WAY TO OPPOSE THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

DEAR SIR—If we lack evidence that men will more readily rally round the banner of a party than enlist themselves as the champions of a principle, I think we have it in the reports of the meetings, speeches, and resolutions, in opposition to the increased grant to Maynooth. *There are noble exceptions*; but the prevailing character of the opposition is sectarian; and this avowedly. The cry is raised and echoed, "Protestantism for ever." It is a matter of no marvel that the dignitaries and admirers of the protestant church as by law established should eye with any feeling but satisfaction the extension, to another sect of religionists, of the pay or privilege which they have hitherto enjoyed alone. They may fairly say to their patron—"By endowing our church you declare it to be the true church—you establish its creed and teach faith in its doctrines: how, then, can you establish another creed and system which, if ours be worthy of faith, can have no claim upon man's acceptance?" If you care for consistency, how can you say to one people, "This is truth," and to another people, "That is truth?" They may argue thus, not questioning the right of a government to patronise and pay the priests and teachers of their sect at the expense of all others. But they who are free from the bondage of state service—who believe in the power of truth to maintain itself—who regard any interference by civil governors with religion, either as supporters or oppressors, to be unjust and indefensible—and who hold that conscience is sacred, and the only dictator in matters between God and the soul—should not be equally ready to oppose the extension of a benefit to a sect because it is not *their* sect. They can oppose it on higher ground. It is not for them to say, "Oh! don't give more money to Maynooth; it's not a protestant college." Better that they should boldly utter their faith that religion can support itself—that men are not to be taxed to support any doctrines, be they true or be they false—and that no man should be the better or the worse off as a citizen for any belief he may hold or avow. Better that they should lay "the axe at the root," and, instead of making a hubbub about practices, expose the falseness of the principle whence they spring. Grant that a state may apply its resources to the endowment of a religious sect, what shall hinder its endowment of two sects, or of every sect? If there be no wrong in the state-payment of protestant ecclesiastics in England, where is the wrong in the state-payment of popish ecclesiastics in Ireland? Unless *persecution* be proper—unless it be commendable to treat a man the worse because of his belief, can it be right to deny to a man, because he is a papist, any privilege which he might have if he were a protestant?

There is a legitimate ground of opposition to the grant which is not sectarian, which is specially a religious ground, and which will prove to be the only maintainable ground. It is this: that a state has nothing to do with religion; that consciences, and creeds, and modes of worship, lie out of its jurisdiction; and that it cannot rightfully appropriate its resources to the diffusion, support, or enforcement of any system of doctrines whatever. Of course the English hierarchy cannot subscribe to this. They must be conservative of "vested interests." But nonconformists, who have, or ought to have, no interests at heart but those of truth, and who have no fear for the safety of the church or the perpetuation of the truth, should not stoop to join in the mere sectarian cry, indicative of self-love, and of fear, and of a narrow mind—should wish for and seek no ad-

vantage for themselves other than that of "holding the truth"—should not attempt to defend truth by means which that truth disapproves—should not fight with the weapons of worldliness against a spiritual wrong—should see to it that they stand on a rock, and not on a bog—that they speak the simple words of a principle, and not shout with the crowd the "shibboleth" and the "anathema" of a party.

How much will be gained for truth, if, instead of opposition petitions, in which churchmen and nonconformists can unite, the latter sever, and avail themselves everywhere of the opportunity, afforded by the present measure, of placing before the country, and on the table of "the House," a united, plain, and emphatic protest against the principle embodied in every government act akin to the one proposed. It may be hoped that dissenters will learn from their enemies what they will not learn from their friends; and it is not unlikely that the present movement will prove an effectual help to those who are commencing another movement, by attempting to teach nonconformists what nonconformity is.

Pardon the length of this letter, and believe me,
Dear sir, yours very sincerely,

W. L. R. C.

LEICESTERSHIRE JUSTICE.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR—I trust you "will have a word to say upon this subject next week;" and, while you are about it, will you be kind enough to remove the impression which seemed to rest upon the minds of Sir John Easthope, and other members, that there is anything very extraordinary in the conduct of the magistrates in question? for you, sir, know as well as I do, that Leicestershire has witnessed these "fantastic tricks" for years. Sir John also dwelt upon the fact of Messrs Abney and Cresswell having imposed the utmost penalty in their power; but it is notoriously the rule, generally speaking, and not the exception, for the heaviest penalty to be imposed at Ash-la-Zouch and Loughborough. Look at the game case recently cited by Mr Bright, where one man was summarily committed by Messrs Abney and Cresswell for ten months, and his companions (one of whom was a boy of eleven years of age) for eight months each, for what was, in fact, but one offence; and you may recollect, also, that the victim of the "Strange and Painful Story," whose case appeared in most of the London papers at the end of last January, was likewise committed from Ashby.

Mr Packe, chairman of the Leicestershire Quarter Sessions, warmly defended the offending magistrates; was convinced that it was "a mere error, and that no corrupt motive could have influenced them;" and "trusted that no further steps would be taken to injure these respectable gentlemen," &c. While I will not for a moment impute corrupt motives to either of these gentlemen, I must say, that Mr Packe knows as well as most men that this is not an isolated case of severity—that there is not in the Leicestershire commission a gentleman so ill-qualified by nature for a magistrate as Mr Cresswell—and that the public interest demands that the inquiry into the mode in which justice is administered in that county should not stop short at the cases of Lakin and Ward, particularly when it is recollect that Mr Cresswell has transacted, and possibly still transacts, no small amount of magisterial business at his own private house. I trust, sir, it will be ascertained whether it is still usual for three cases to be heard at the same table (a fourth being meanwhile heard at a small tea-table in a corner), in a room at a public house, in which plaintiffs and defendants, witnesses and spectators, are so mingled together, amid such noise and confusion, that it is almost impossible to distinguish one from the other—whether, in consequence of this Babel-like state of things, the same gross mistakes occur, to the injury of both plaintiffs and defendants—whether it is still usual for one magistrate to hear a case that ought to be heard by two, the letter of the law being complied with by getting a second magistrate to attach his name to the conviction—whether the depositions are now taken upon any scrap of paper which is afterwards destroyed, thus rendering it impossible to get a copy of the evidence in case an appeal is desired—whether cases are still brought from all parts of the county, out of other petty sessional divisions, for the purpose of increasing the business of one notorious court, and, of course, of adding to the fees—whether persons, of hitherto unblemished character, are still sent to prison on the slightest pretexts, in the most reckless manner, without regard to age or sex—whether it is still usual for common informers, whose hired witnesses have been convicted of perjury and theft, to earwig magistrates during the progress of a case, and even to go with them when they retire to a private room to consider their decision—whether, in short, the same farce and mockery of justice is now enacted as has been witnessed by Mr Packe (for he has frequently sat there), and by

Yours respectfully,

W. S. DARKIN.

HOMEOPATHY—A MISTAKE REGARDING IT

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

DEAR SIR—The misstatements of fools have not much consequence. Not so with the misstatements of men of understanding. Such convey far and wide injury, by giving sanction to untruth, and, consequently, to error. Feeling any remarks made by you will have the influence which the utterances of a man of understanding ought to have, it was with regret that I perceived, in your paper of Wednesday last, two references to homeopathy, in which you put forth as homeopathy what is not homeopathy, and then reason upon this, which is not.

In your speech on the proposed grant to Maynooth, when treating of the present race of legislators at St Stephens, you remark, "They appear to act upon the homeopathic principle in politics. They seek to remove disease by aggravating it." And, in a leading article in the same paper—the article entitled "Cui Bono?"—you remark, in reference to the same legislators, "Cannot these gentlemen perceive that two and two make four? Or are they all, to a man, homeopaths in politics, confident that the shortest method of curing national disease is by aggravating it?"

These two quotations show that your idea of homeopathic treatment is that it is "aggravation." The fact is, however, that it is quite the contrary. In fact, homeopathy is the embodiment of the principle that, in curing a disease, a remedy must be used which has the power of exciting similar but not identical phenomena; and

that these two, namely, the disease and the remedy, thus analogous, being brought to act and react one on the other, health is the result.

So far from aggravation of symptoms being a characteristic of homeopathy, it is common result of the common system of medical treatment. It is then spoken of as the *re-action of the system*. So that if aggravation did attend the homeopathic system of treatment, it would not be characteristic of homeopathy.

But it is found that when the homeopathic means is properly selected, and then administered in the right quantity, the disease is removed without any aggravation.

Trusting that the insertion of these statements will correct the impression respecting homeopathy, which your references to it are likely to convey, allow me to remain, Your well-wisher and constant reader,

April 5, 1845. A HOMEOPATHIST.

General News.

METROPOLITAN.

ANTI-CORN-LAW LEAGUE.—On Wednesday night, the League re-assembled at Covent Garden theatre in even greater than the usual numbers. Long before the chair was taken, the house was crowded to excess. Mr Wilson, on taking the chair, congratulated the meeting, which he was happy to see so numerous and enthusiastic, on the progress which had been made in the cause since they had last assembled, and then went into details respecting the bazaar which was to be established on the spot forthwith, as well to aid the funds of the League as to exhibit specimens of British skill, taste, and industry. Colonel Thompson, in a brief energetic speech, illustrated the evils of the system of protection by a variety of quaint similes. In the course of his speech, the gallant colonel thus referred to the manner in which he had been excluded from the House of Commons:—

It is true—"and pity 'tis 'tis true"—that, eighteen years ago, I was bestirring myself in this great cause. Nine years back, I was doing what one man might do to oppose in the House of Commons that arrangement of the existing government by which the interests of the English church were bound up with the continuance of the corn laws [hear]. All would not do; upon the first opportunity I was cashiered. Had I had the fair chance of other men, I might have been alive at this hour to serve you [laughter]. It is not me you see; it is my wailing ghost [laughter]. I was assassinated seven years ago in Marylebone [renewed laughter]. Well, that is a long story, and out of the present question: I was innocent, and some time or other it will be found out. When that is the way people paid those who tried to lead them, no wonder if nine times nine years passed over their heads before they attained the object of their wishes [hear]. I have no ill omen, however, to bring before you now: nothing but well and fair—symptoms of success wherever we have been.

The feature of the evening was the appearance of Mr Houghton, of Broom hall, Sunning hill, Berkshire—a great agriculturist, and a convert to free trade.

He was introduced by Mr Cobden as farming 3,000 acres himself, and also having the management, either as proprietor or agent, of 100,000 acres.

Mr Houghton said he had been an upholder of "protection" for twenty years, and now gave his reasons

for abandoning the ship in which he had so long sailed.

He alluded to the signal failure of each successive corn law, especially its failure to secure the price it professed to guarantee. The result of his experience was, that it was impossible for any man, however clever, to control the seasons, or to settle what should be the price of the bread of man.

While they were obliged to sell at 45s., under a system that promised them a price of at least 54s., it was, he considered, useless to talk of maintaining such a system; and he had, therefore, made up his mind to assist in trying whether they might not, by extending the commercial enterprise of the country, increase their own prosperity—be enabled to grow more wheat at home, and also find more persons to eat it. He was now conscientiously opposed to monopoly; but it was not to monopoly in corn alone, but also to monopoly in sugar and timber, that he felt opposed. Mr Cobden then addressed the meeting. In the course of his remarks he said:—

The question now, then, was, who is to do our work?

There was a rising bidding between Sir R. Peel and Lord John Russell; but who would have the honour of carrying out the great principle? [loud cries of "You, you, you!" followed by loud and protracted cheers.]

Perhaps their friend of the Reform bill and the Test and Corporation acts, and who made the first bid, but not up to the mark, would get the preference.

Mr Fox followed, with an eloquent exposition of the advantages to be derived from the adoption of free trade principles.

We have only room for one short extract from his speech, relative to his frequent attacks on the aristocracy:—

There was another accusation made against the League, in which he sometimes had had the honour of finding himself personally implicated [hear, hear, and a laugh]. There was one newspaper which always gave to the world a stereotyped version of everything that, at these meetings, he chanced to say. It was always stated there that, after such and such a speech, he "uttered his usual tirade against the aristocracy of the country" [a laugh]. He wished to say a word on this matter. He did not profess to be a warm admirer of aristocracy [enthusiastic cheering]. For the legally constituted aristocracy of the country he had all that love, and all that reverence, which the laws of the country required, and it could be no man's duty to entertain more [laughter]. But he had never come here to express his opinion on the aristocracy, or the suffrage question, or any other great question put in abeyance by the single arm of the anti-corn-law agitation—an abeyance from which he trusted, however, that they would speedily arise [loud cheers], and for which he was looking anxiously, as he saw that the present question must be settled first—and the sooner the better. But all that he had ever said about the aristocracy had been said about certain members of the aristocracy—not in their capacity of aristocrats, but in their capacity of tradesmen [loud laughter and cheers].

THE HAMPSTEAD MURDER.—TRIAL OF THOMAS HOCKER.

The trial of Thomas Hocker for the murder of James Delarue, at Hampstead, occupied the Central Criminal Court the whole of Friday. The court was thronged by spectators. Hocker, who preserved his confident air, pleaded "Not guilty" in a firm voice. The evidence was, with no material exception, the same as that produced at the preliminary examinations before the magistrate and the coroner. One additional witness was produced—William Satterthwaite, a shoemaker, of Hampstead;

who came up while Hocker was standing over the dead body with the policeman Baldock. He observed to Hocker that the dead man resembled George Ward, a bootmaker; on which the other said that could not be, for he had beautiful white hands, unlike a shoemaker's. Mr Clarkson and Mr Ballantine, as counsel for the prisoner, cross-examined the witnesses on his behalf; but he preferred to address the jury in person. Before he did so, Mr Justice Coleridge said that, if he was not quite prepared, he might have a short time for consideration.

He replied, "Thank you, my lord, I should like just five minutes;" and so saying, he turned away and stepped lightly down stairs into the passage that runs between the prison and the dock. On his reappearance, he maintained the same unconcerned and flighty manner that had marked his conduct throughout the trial. He advanced to the centre of the dock, holding in his hand three or four sheets of manuscript. He then folded his arms and stood for nearly a minute perfectly cool and impassive, as if waiting for silence to be restored.

The stillness of the papers showed that not a nerve trembled. In a clear tone, but with a mincing and somewhat laboured enunciation, he read rather a long defence, composed in a vulgarly romantic style. The two grand questions, he said, were, how his clothes came to be saturated with blood, and how he came into possession of Delarue's property?

Delarue had often assisted him with money, so often that he was ashamed to own it; and, therefore, he told his relatives the story of his having borrowed some from Mrs Edwards. The £12 was given him by Delarue on the morning of the murder. The watch and ring had been given him to get repaired and reset. He had often had valuable property of Delarue's in his possession—once a telescope, worth seven or eight pounds. [His father afterwards confirmed that statement.] With respect to the bloody state of his clothes, he never would divulge the cause: it would be "fiendish and futile" to do so.

A person, in his devotedness to him, had offered to forswear himself to account for it; but he declined.

About a year ago, he imprudently introduced Delarue to a beautiful young lady at Hampstead, to whom he himself was paying his addresses. This girl Delarue seduced. The parents and brother were bent on revenge. Urged by them, Hocker wrote the note signed "Caroline," found in Delarue's pocket, appointing an assignation: he walked towards the spot with the young lady's brother, but he waited at the Swiss Cottage tavern, while the other went on alone, to meet the seducer. Hearing a cry of "Murder!" he hurried to the place. The circumstances accounted for his agitation, when he

witnessed the result of that revenge, which had for its object, not death, but serious mutilation."

He returned to the Swiss tavern. His clothes were not bloody then; and the waiter observed that his hands were "white," but noticed no blood. "I hurried to the house of the perpetrator, who had flown there for refuge. I then took the whole upon myself, as I had been the principal cause of the tragedy. I immediately rushed from the house, and sought a slaughterhouse in Hampstead, and disfigured my clothes in a pool of blood which I found handy. You see, gentlemen, I cannot account for the bloody state of my clothes without giving a reason for making them so—here is the difficulty. I will not say anything to acquit myself—that is, at the best, only dubious, and which is calculated to involve others in addition to myself. I cannot say more—my mind is almost bewildered."

The reading of this extraordinary statement caused great astonishment in the court. Mr Justice Coleridge carefully summed up: the jury retired, and, after ten minutes' deliberation, returned a verdict of "Guilty!"

Hocker smiled, slightly bowed to the jury, and resumed his bold attitude and cool aspect. The judge, moralising on the youth of the convict (he is but twenty-two years of age), his abilities, his crimes, and his miserable fate, pronounced sentence of death. Preserving his firmness of demeanour to the last, the prisoner was led from the court.

PROVINCIAL.

CHESS BY TELEGRAPH.—The game of chess which we announced last week was to be played by means of the electric telegraph, by players stationed at the opposite termini of the South Western railway, came off on Thursday. The players were the celebrated

Mr Staunton, who vanquished the great French player, St Amant, and Mr Walker, the well known writer upon the game. Mr Staunton was at Gosport, and Mr Walker at Nine Elms. The moves were communicated as they were made, by telegraphic signal, to the other player, the squares on the board being numbered 1 to 64, and the signals referring to those numbers. The respective moves were communicated to Southampton from Nine Elms, as well

for the satisfaction of a party of gentlemen assembled at the terminus, as to test the wonderful powers of the telegraph. No sooner was a move made upon the board by Mr Staunton, at Gosport, than it was made known to his opponent in London, and almost

in the same instant was communicated to Southampton. The match concluded at eight o'clock on Thursday night, in a "drawn game," a rook and

three pawns being left on each side.—*Hants Independent.*

At the quarterly meeting of the iron-masters of the midland districts, held at Birmingham on Thursday, it was resolved, as at previous meetings elsewhere, to make an advance of forty shillings per ton on the price of bar-iron.

THE ASSIZES.—At Norwich, on Monday and Tuesday, three young men, Royal, Mapes, and Hall, were tried for the murder of Mrs Candler, in November last, at Great Yarmouth. The woman kept a chandler's shop; she had recently received a legacy of £150, of which she made no secret; and during the night of the 18th November, she was found by the police murdered in her shop. The three men were suspected and arrested; and the circumstantial evidence against them was strong; but the strongest was that given by Samuel Yarham, a man who lodged in the upper part of the woman's house. He declared, that on the night of the murder he heard a noise in the shop, and went to discover the cause; when he found two men there, Royal and Mapes, Hall standing a short distance off: Royal, with whom he was acquainted, told him they had murdered the old woman, offered him some of the spoil, and threatened vengeance if he betrayed them; which so alarmed him that he said nothing of the murder till he was himself arrested on a charge of having committed it. Cross-examination did not make the witness swerve from his story, but it elicited some facts not very favourable to his own character; and to him Mr Prendergast, counsel for Royal and Hall, imputed the commission of the crime. Witnesses were called to prove an alibi in the prisoners' favour. After ten minutes' deliberation, the jury acquitted them all.—At Warwick, last week, James Crowley was tried for the murder of one Tilsley, at noon on Christmas day, 1842, at Spenal. Crowley had had some differences with his father; and the old man had Tilsley appointed a constable, for his protection; early on Christmas day, Crowley went to his father's house, but Tilsley denied him admittance; on which he threatened vengeance. He returned to his own residence, dressed himself in his best clothes, took a double-barreled gun, mounted his horse and rode over to his father's; there he met Tilsley, shot him dead, and went away. He escaped to America; whence he returned last year, and was arrested at Chester. When seized, he admitted that he shot the man, which he thought "it was his duty to do!" The evidence was conclusive in every part. Mr Hill, the prisoner's counsel, pleaded insanity: several of Crowley's family had been insane. The jury, however, found a verdict of "Guilty;" and sentence of death was passed on the prisoner; who heard it unmoved.—At the Liverpool assizes, on Friday week, in the case of "The Queen v. the Poor-law guardians of Rochdale," a verdict was entered for the Crown, damage £1.

MURDER OF A MOTHER BY HER SON.—A most dreadful murder has been committed at Kendal, in Westmoreland. On Saturday week, a man named Richard Simpson, about thirty-five years of age, in a fit of drunkenness, so dreadfully beat his mother with a poker, as to cause her death the next day. The unfortunate woman lived with her son, who is a man of property living on his own estate. He was described as being in the habit of drinking to excess. The poker was actually broken in two by the violence of the blows, and one of the surgeons on the inquest stated that he had seen the body of a man killed in a prize fight, much less bruised than the deceased. He was committed for trial, on the coroner's warrant, for wilful murder. The prisoner maintained the greatest indifference; he was removed heavily ironed, as he had, when first taken into custody, made a desperate assault on the police, and is a powerful, and, when enraged, a very desperate character.

The *Morning Post* reports that the Queen's visit to Ireland is fixed to take place early in July; and that, in order to allow the attendance of Cabinet ministers on her Majesty, the parliamentary session will be brought to a close much sooner than usual.

INCOME TAX.—The number of persons who return themselves to the income tax as having £150 per annum and no more, is 200,000. Thus, then, one-fifth of the five millions is paid to this odious tax by exactly the very class who can least afford it.

Postscript.

Wednesday, April 16.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.—The early part of the sitting of the House of Commons yesterday was, as usual, taken up with the presentation of petitions against the Maynooth Grant. Mr HINDLEY presented 120 petitions. Colonel SIBTHORP gave notice that tomorrow he should move that the petitions which had been presented for and against the increased grant to Maynooth should be forthwith printed (loud laughter). He meant that a comparative statement of numbers and signatures, for and against, should be printed without delay. Mr FERRAND then moved that the petition of the Dublin Operative Protestant association, calling for the impeachment of Sir R. PEEL, should be printed with the votes. Colonel RAWDON did not think that the House should sanction such a proposition, pointing out a passage in the petition relating to the coronation oath, and couched in terms offensive to all Roman catholics. After some conversation, Sir JAMES GRAHAM professed

his willingness to consent to the printing of the petition, provided that Mr FERRAND would distinctly pledge himself to found a motion upon it. Mr FERRAND had already given notice of an amendment on the third reading of the Maynooth bill, which would be based upon the allegations of the petition, and subsequently withdrew his motion. The adjourned debate on the second reading of the Maynooth Endowment bill was then resumed. MAJOR BERESFORD, COLONEL VERNER, and Mr NEWDEGATE opposed the bill, because it interfered with the protestant character of the constitution. Mr PAKINGTON defended government. Mr HUME and Mr BYNG supported the measure on the general principles of toleration. Mr P. M. STEWART viewed the change from an annual into a permanent grant as involving an important principle, because it adopted Maynooth as one of the endowed institutions of the country, and thereby departed from that perpetual protest which this nation maintained against popery. The EARL OF LINCOLN supported the measure, as one tending to the pacification of Ireland. LORD WORSLEY, Mr M. MILNES, Mr SERGEANT MURPHY, Mr ROSS, and Mr GORE followed in support of the bill; Sir JOHN HAMMER against it. The debate was again, without any opposition, adjourned.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—Lord BROUGHAM last night again called the attention of the House to a subject which he has lately more than once noticed—the spread of railroad speculations, and their interference with the enjoyment, nay, almost with the possession, of property. It was time for the legislature to intervene, for tyrannical powers such as those claimed by railroad companies had never been granted to any other associations. This was the only case in the history of civilised nations of compulsory sales forced upon the community. He concluded by suggesting two new standing orders, which are to be printed and laid upon the table. Lord DALHOUSIE cautioned the House against admitting, to its full extent, the statement made by Lord Brougham. It contained much truth, but was on the whole too highly-coloured. Several bills were then forwarded a stage, and their lordships adjourned.

WEST KENT ELECTION.—Lord Holmesdale has retired, and Colonel Austen is to be brought forward by the unanimous concurrence of both committees. At least, this is the present proposition, but the decision awaits confirmation by the electors to-morrow. Colonel Austen is an anti-Maynooth gentleman. Mr FREWEN, a staunch protestant, was the former anti-Maynooth candidate in opposition to Lord Holmesdale, and will probably retire also. The *Times* opposes Mr Frewen's retirement.

THE AGITATION AGAINST THE MAYNOOTH GRANT loses nothing of its energy. At a meeting of English Roman catholics, attended by a large number of noblemen, held yesterday, at Freemason's tavern, to petition in favour of the measure, Lord Beaumont said that the Premier had declared that, rather than give way, he would retire from office. Indeed, such an event is much speculated upon at the clubs and on 'Change. We have heard that, at the former, parties who are fond of gambling in such matters have laid bets of four to one that Sir R. Peel will resign office ere the lapse of another week. This is improbable, but shows what is likely to be the result of the present agitation, if the people of this country persevere. It remains for dissenters, by their efforts and their unceasing vindication of the voluntary principle, to decide whether the present government shall be upset on a question of theological rancour, or of opposition to all state churches. The crisis is a momentous one; and we implore the opponents of the grant to protest and petition against it, not as protestants, but as the enemies of priesthood and of all endowment for religious purposes. If such be the preponderating influence which ejects the present government, the fate of at least the Irish church establishment is sealed. We have reports of meetings at Surrey chapel, attended by 1,500 persons, and presided over by Sir C. E. Smith; at Liverpool, where the electors are holding meetings to take steps for ejecting their present representatives on the first opportunity; at Blackburn, and at Doncaster. At both of the last-named places the clergy of the establishment were signally defeated in open meetings of the inhabitants on the question of endowments. We have not room to give further particulars this week. We have received several letters, suggesting that the Anti-state-church Association should hold a great meeting in some central part of the metropolis, to unite dissenters in their opposition to the grant on the only just principle. "We want," says one of the writers, "aggregate meetings, with respectable talent, such as we can command on the platform; then the daily papers will notice at length our speeches, and so multiply their power." He then makes the following practical suggestion:—

Can we not have Covent Garden theatre for a demonstration of enlightened, powerful, invincible, opposition? Are there not thousands who would eagerly embrace such an opportunity of making Parliament listen to us instead of throwing behind their back, with impunity, those views of ours which now only meet their view through the medium of a minority of the petitions presented? I am told, by a friend, the theatre is to be hired for £40; printing done for £10 more; and 2,000 persons contributing sixpence each would repay the whole. If the experiment was spiritedly made, I do not doubt it would be successful.

THE GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.—The obnoxious and dishonest measure of the Premier is calling up against it, just in proportion as its unscriptural and iniquitous character is laid bare, the honest and determined opposition of thinking persons; and, we are happy to add, that opposition is based on the only proper principle, namely, "That the application, by law, of the resources of the state to the maintenance of any form or forms of religious worship and instruction, is contrary to reason, hostile to human liberty, and directly opposed to the word of God." At the immense gathering of the members and friends of the British Anti-state-church Association, at the Tabernacle, Moorfields, on Monday evening last, Dr Campbell in the chair, this principle was prominently put forth. The "no popery" cry found no supporters there; but there was one important feature most eloquently and forcibly introduced by Mr Forster, independent minister of Highgate, and unanimously and right heartily responded to by the 2,000 persons there assembled, which we do not recollect to have been even alluded to, much less broadly stated, elsewhere: it is that contained in the following resolution:—

"That this meeting is of opinion that the past supineness and indifference displayed by dissenters respecting the progress of their principles, and with regard to the injustice of state churches, have unintentionally encouraged the government to take the initiative in the increase of the Maynooth grant of establishing by law the Roman catholic church in Ireland; and that this meeting pledges itself to do its utmost to induce dissenters to use all the means which the Bible and the British constitution can furnish, or will allow, in order to obtain the peaceful and legal abolition of all state churches in this empire."

J. Scoble, Esq., most ably seconded the resolution. Our space only permits us further to add, that the meeting was a most effective one; and that, had the daily organs felt it their interest to have reported, at length, the proceedings, as they have done those of the anti-popery meetings of Covent Garden, &c., thousands would have been called into active opposition against the measure, who now keep aloof in consequence of the unsoundness of the grounds on which the Roman Catholic Endowment bill has too generally been opposed. Mr Burnet addressed the meeting for upwards of an hour, in which he stripped off the mask from Sir R. Peel, and exposed the inconsistency—and something worse—of Mr Gladstone; while Daniel O'Connell and Lord John Russell were placed before the audience in their true light. The whole case, in its real character, was fully and ably developed, several other speakers took part, and the meeting separated at 10 o'clock. About 750 signatures were appended to the petition, which now lies at the following places for further signature:—Mr Selby, 54, Leonard street, Finsbury; Mr Elliott, 40, Middlesex place, Hackney road; Mr Gooding, 161, Hoxton Old Town; Mr Ashton, 86, City road; Mr Sim, 1, Pittfield street; Mr Stroud, 4, Clifton street; and Mr Greenshaw, Walbrook place, East road.

REPEAL ASSOCIATION.—**MAYNOOTH.**—At the meeting of the Association on Monday, the Maynooth grant was again the prominent subject of discussion. Mr O'Connell brought forward and read a report on the bill for the perpetual endowment of Maynooth. The committee, after giving an abstract of the bill, stated their opinion to be, that it was framed in a just and conciliatory spirit, and offered no matter of doubt or difficulty to any Roman catholic, however suspicious he might have been made by the conduct of the present or any former government. They also expressed their belief that, circumstanced as the country is with its ecclesiastical and state revenues, originally granted for Roman catholic purposes, it was no infringement of the voluntary principle to receive by way of restitution the means of educating the catholic clergy, especially when tendered in so satisfactory and conciliatory a manner. He then alluded to the excitement in this country. A sudden change had, he said, taken place. The government of England was now friendly to Ireland—the people adverse:—

Why were not other grants opposed, and why had such an outcry been raised against the grant of a suitable endowment for Maynooth? The truth was, they hated them as Irishmen, and were bigoted against them as catholics (hear, hear). Proud and bigoted as were their English neighbours (and they might well be proud of having such a people as the Irish for their slaves), they would not continue to be their slaves (cheers).

In reference to petitioning in favour of the bill, he said—

The Irish people would not stoop to ask for such a trifling (hear, hear). When millions were owing to them, they would not beg for a penny in the pound (hear, hear). They had not, therefore, asked for this bill, but they would cheerfully accept it, if it were passed.

Mr H. GRATTAN, M.P., said that the people of England had declared war on the Irish people by their conduct in reference to the Maynooth grant, and he had learnt a lesson within the last forty-eight hours which he might forgive but would never forget. He took his leave of the "gentlemen of England;" he wished them no ill, but, so help him God, he would never willingly draw a sword in their behalf or give them a guinea of his money (loud cheers). Other speakers indulged in similar views. The rent for the week was £700 4s. 11d.

CORN MARKET. MARK LANE. THIS DAY.

	Wheat	Barley	Oats	Beans	Peas	Flour
English ..	2910	3550	1030			
Scotch.....						
Irish		16350			
Foreign ..		740	1270			

The market is not very brisk, and the prices same as Monday.

Terms for advertising in the *Nonconformist*.
 For 7 lines....5s. 0d. | For 10 lines....6s. 0d.
 For every additional line.....4d.
 * Advertisements from the country must be accompanied by a post-office order, or reference for payment in London.

The Nonconformist.

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1845.

SUMMARY.

THE game is fairly afoot. The ministerial bill is making headway against a stress of squally weather. It may, indeed, reach the haven of the royal assent, but not without having to breast as stormy a sea as ever cabinet craft encountered. Petitions roll into the House of Commons in mountainous surges. Public meetings, like heavy gusts of wind, keep up the roar and turmoil of the political elements. Deputations are arriving from various parts of the empire, to instruct, if they cannot persuade, their representatives. The contest is now between the people and their own legislative chamber—and it must be settled there, if it is to be settled at all. All our energies must be concentrated on this single focus. The present is not the time for action on the House of Lords. Let no strength, therefore, be prematurely exhausted upon them. Let no petitions be sent up to them, until the Maynooth bill is fairly out of the lower House. Our resources must be husbanded. But it must not be forgotten that those resources are far more ample than we have been wont to imagine.

A general election is drawing nigh. Now is the time to make the seats of members tremble beneath them. How may this be done? This question we may answer by another. What pseudo-liberal was not placed in parliament by the aid of dissenters? Are nonconforming electors, then, willing to be again misrepresented? If so, let them trust simply to petitioning. If not, let them individually write to their members, and give them warning to quit. There needs no trespass beyond the boundaries of respect. But, in these days, men's minds must be unequivocally told. Well, then, let every dissenter who has a representative forthwith do his part to enlighten that representative's understanding. A sheet of paper, and a penny postage stamp, a little time, and less courage, is all that it will cost him to deliver his testimony against all church and state alliance. A short letter, directly to the point, and addressed to the M.P. at the House of Commons, will not be thrown away. We ask each of our readers to do this forthwith—not to retire to rest this night before it be done. And, whatever may become of this bill, the agitation against it, thus energetically and faithfully carried on, will be productive of the most beneficial results.

The second reading of the bill was moved by Sir Robert Peel on Friday evening, after the presentation of *two thousand three hundred and seventy-five* petitions. The debate was opened heavily by Mr Colquhoun, who moved that the bill be read a second time that day six months. He was supported by Mr Grogan, who, equally with the mover of the amendment, based his opposition to the measure principally upon theologically-sectarian grounds. Then came Mr Gladstone, ex-president of the Board of Trade. He admitted that the sense of a great majority of the people of England and Scotland was opposed to the measure—that all his own predilections ran counter to it—but that, nevertheless, he would deliberately support it. It was not on the ground of compact, for that he did not believe in—nor of restitution, for that he indignantly renounced—that he meant to give his vote with Sir Robert Peel; but with a view to soothe and soften the tone of the college of Maynooth itself. His chief reason, however, at least, as he announced it, sprung out of the weakness of the reasons which had been urged against the measure—which reasons he forthwith proceeded to demolish, leaving his hearers to wonder what motive could ever have prompted him to leave a cabinet which had his most hearty support. Whereupon, up rose Mr D'Israeli, and delivered himself of one of those philippics against Sir Robert Peel and mediocrity, which, like a harpoon left sticking in a whale's back, although not mortal in its immediate effects, hasten on the hour of mortality by weakening the strength, and letting out not a little of the vitality, of the existing system. Keen irony that went to the quick, fancies as happy in expression as they were mortifying in their purport, allusions sufficiently remote to be piquant, and yet intelligible enough to raise the broad laugh of derision, played through the speech like so many flashes of blue lightning, as though intended to excite the terror of his victim. At last the bolt fell, suddenly, and with an awful crash:

But whatever motives and impressions may influence the various notions, there is, at least, one common ground for the creation of a new opposition and an animating principle, which should alike inspire us. Let us, in this House, re-echo that which I believe to be the common sentiment of the country. Let us tell the people in high places that which is the conviction of all England, and that they must, at length, be taught that

cunning is not caution, and that habitual perfidy is not high policy [hear, hear]. On these grounds, let us bring back to the House that which so long existed—namely, the salutary check of a constitutional opposition, which the country requires and looks to, and thus terminate a dynasty of deception, by putting an end to this intolerable yoke of official despotism and parliamentary impotence."

Mr Roebuck followed, in a speech which was neither good-tempered, happy, nor wise. He rebuked Mr D'Israeli in a tone which appeared to us very much like mortification, that he had been eclipsed in his own line. He assumed the air of a great statesman, who knew a vast deal more, and was infinitely more disinterested, than his constituents, to whom, indeed, he felt bound to set a good example; but as to his views, seemingly so large and comprehensive in his own estimation, we could make nothing better nor more original of them than this—that, when Cerberus barks, you must throw him a sop. Not very profound, after all, Mr Arthur Roebuck! The debate was then adjourned.

The adjourned debate on the proposed endowment of Maynooth college, was resumed on Monday, but was of a somewhat dull character. Most of the speakers discussed the consequences of endowing the Roman catholic clergy, which it was generally believed was almost a necessary consequence of their education by the state. Indeed, the Premier was so hard pressed on this subject, that he can scarcely escape declaring his future intentions. Mr Hawes said that he was willing to vote for the grant if paid out of the property of the Irish protestant establishment; but that, if Mr Ward's amendment were rejected, he should feel himself at liberty, on the third reading of the bill, to take a comprehensive view of its effects, not only on Irish, but on British, politics. The principal speaker of the evening was Mr Macaulay, who entered into an elaborate defence both of the principle and policy of the measure. Following in the wake of Mr D'Israeli, he passed in review the political acts of Sir R. Peel for the last twenty years, and pointed out, with masterly effect, and a strict regard to historical accuracy, the total want of principle which had marked his career; but, unlike the hon. member for Shrewsbury, he concluded by declaring his intention to give a cordial support to the government proposition, even at the risk of his seat. Mr Fox Maule opposed the measure in a telling speech. He urged that, with reference to Scotland, government had declared that the state could have no connexion with a church which disclaimed its interference, and yet they endowed Maynooth without seeking any control over it. Several members of minor note took the opportunity of stating their views on the question; and eventually the debate was again adjourned. We rejoice to find that an opportunity will yet be offered for bringing the question of state endowments of religion distinctly before the House. On the same evening, Mr Sharman Crawford gave notice that he should, at a future stage of the bill, move the following amendment:

"That the principle of the support of any religious sect or sects by endowment from the state, or by any grants or funds from the state, or by compulsory assessments, under any name or denomination whatsoever, whether tithes, rents, rent charge, cess, or taxes, is a violation of the rights of conscience, detrimental to religious truth, and dangerous to civil and religious freedom; and that all such grants or endowments ought to be abolished."

The Maynooth discussion has thrown all other parliamentary topics into the shade. Mr T. Duncombe's failure, on Tuesday evening se'nnight, to place a man's correspondence upon the same footing of security as his person, notwithstanding his able and unanswerable speech, was too much a matter of course to excite surprise; and Mr Christie's motion for a royal commission "to inquire into, and report upon, all matters relating to the privileges, revenues, trusts, and to the state of education, learning, and religion, in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and of the colleges of those universities," brought forward on Thursday evening, and rejected by 143 to 82, elicited the usual amount, from the usual men, of bigotry and narrow-mindedness. Mr Cowper's Field Garden bill, one of those measures of modern times which, under the guise of a benevolent object, are ramifying a system of universal state meddling, and intolerable tyranny, was read a second time on Wednesday, after an intimation from the Home Secretary, that, to some features of the measure, he should offer his decided resistance in committee.

The House of Lords has done little else, during the past week, than receive petitions against the Maynooth grant. On Friday, after a long debate destitute of all novelty of argument, the Sugar Duties bill was read a third time and passed. On Monday night, a short discussion took place relative to the railway board and Irish railways. In the early part of the evening several peers took the opportunity, on the presentation of petitions against the Maynooth grant, to express their views on the subject.

The League meeting at Covent Garden theatre was so like all its predecessors, as to claim no special remark from us. Of the approaching

bazaar, magnificent descriptions are given in the public prints—and, doubtless, it will present a very striking spectacle. Other domestic matters of interest there are none—for the Maynooth agitation swallows up everything else.

MEASURE FOR MEASURE.

"Haste still pays haste, and leisure answers leisure; Like doth quit like, and measure still for measure."

THE history of the present month has been like the last act of a play. Destiny comes forward on the stage, and metes out to crime its appropriate punishment. There is apparent confusion, but real order—the confusion is simply that of blind instruments—the order, that of a great superintending agent. We find marvelous coalitions, but their fruit is ruin—numberless hypocrisies, but none of them deceive—zeal in inflicting well deserved chastisement, but unable to conceal its own worthlessness—a sudden show of energy, justly suspected on account of past supineness—every one exposing the wretched pretences of others, only to suffer exposure in his turn. In truth, this Maynooth grant has converted the House of Commons into a theatre, not for temporary amusement, but for real instruction—and over its doors may be written, "The progress and fate of 'organised hypocrisy' exhibited here."

We have a government which rode into place and power upon an acted lie—professing to be the choice of a people whom it corrupted to betray. We have a strong majority, bound in chains by its own creature—coerced into a consent to measures which they spent a million and a half of money to suppress—made to eat the leek by their own puppet—humbled into the abject supporters of the minister whom they exalted to authority, at a reckless expense of all morality, to subserve their selfish and sinister ends. We have the party who, for the last half century, have traded upon the cry of "No popery," condemned to strangling by the very cry which themselves had raised and sustained. We have a prime minister lashed by one of his own *quondam* adherents, as cunning but not cautious, and as mistaking perfidy for high policy. We have an opposition who, when in power, sacrificed their principles to place, condemned to become the mere subordinate agents in making those principles secure place to their rivals. We have Young England mouthing the maxims of freedom, which yet obtain for him no credit with the people. We have a house of representatives which, in its legislative career, has outstripped all former houses in profligacy, venturing upon a single act which has a show of disinterestedness, and by that act sealing the decree of their own downfall. We have O'Connell accepting a measure, to the utter annihilation of his credit for sincerity, which will, more than any other, put an end to his trade in agitation. We have evangelical churchmen caught and crippled in the trap of their own self accommodating arguments; and dissenters who have done nothing else for years back but cry "Peace! be still!"—and who have attempted their best to gag the few who raised their voices on behalf of their principles—taunted, by the men whom they sought to conciliate, with their past apathy. In all this we see a vivid illustration of the lines of our great dramatist, placed at the head of this article.

Yes! The play is evidently drawing to a close—and the moral is at length beginning to develop itself. "Organised hypocrisies" of all sorts have sustained their several parts, and, one by one, they will be killed off—slain, as becomes them, by each other's hands. Tories, whigs, radicals, repealers, free traders, churchmen, dissenters—all are fated to look their insincerities in the face. The Maynooth bill, like the castle of truth, reveals every pretence—shows up everything that is false. And it is both curious and instructive to perceive how every class is now rebuked and worsted by its own long-cherished lie—how all of them have been employed in grinding and polishing the blade which is sheathed in their own bosom. "The wise" of all parties "have been taken in their own craftiness."

To our minds there is much of hope in all this. Surely, the old is vanishing only to give place to the new. From the passing of the Reform bill until now, government has been but one series of solemn frauds under the name of patriotism. It could be nothing else—the fruit has only corresponded with the tree which produced it. That measure was a deliberately-practised delusion—framed by a portion of the aristocracy to delude the middle classes—accepted by the middle classes to delude the unenfranchised millions. What have we had since? What ought we to have had? A series of devices meant to deceive—a profession of principles never worked out into practice—compromises the most disgraceful—political profligacy the most unblushing—and, at length, a chaos of parties such as the country never before witnessed. And now the beginning of the end is come. The universal fraud is out at elbows, ragged, tattered, and bare. Charlitanism has touched its meridian, and is rapidly sinking in the west. What may come in its place we pretend not to divine. But most heartily can we join with Mr D'Israeli, in seeking what the coun-

try requires, "by dethroning this dynasty of deception, by putting an end to the intolerable yoke of official despotism and parliamentary imposture."

It may, perhaps, seem ungracious in us to choose the present moment for reminding dissenters that, should this Maynooth Endowment bill pass, as we anticipate it will, they will have none but themselves to blame with the result. We have no desire to dispirit them in the exertions they are now putting forth to defeat the measure; and we are especially delighted to observe that, for the most part, they are conducting their opposition, as becomes them, upon the ground of enlightened and generous principle. But when, in high places, they are taxed with the suddenness and recency of their zeal against state endowments—when men like Mr Roebuck can rise in the House of Commons, and, pointing to Canada, Malta, Mauritius, can ask at what former time the dissenters have protested against magisterial interference with the religion of the people—and when we know, from recent experience, that, even at this moment, while the alarm bell is still ringing in their ears, many of the most active conductors of the present agitation set their faces, as flintlike as ever, against the only organisation which is systematically employed in exposing the mischiefs of that alliance between things secular and sacred which themselves, in this particular instance, so loudly condemn—we do trust that the chastisement which their inconsistency has brought upon them from unexpected quarters will do them good, and force them to bewail their former follies. They have long sought to gain respect by a course of expediency, compromise, and silence—and now, the class of men whom they had hoped to win thereby, turn round, and taunt them with the novelty of their convictions. We are glad of it. They richly deserved it—and none but the silly and the soft can view, with other feelings than those of satisfaction, the even-handed dealings of retributive justice.

On the whole, whether Sir Robert Peel's measure be carried or abandoned, one thing is certain—that truth and truthfulness will make of it a stepping stone to a more commanding position. It is like balm to the heart to see this inextricable mess into which conventional *shams* have at length brought their adherents. The gain in this case is not merely against this or that falsehood, but against the empire of falsehood itself. We have always cherished an implicit faith in the doctrine that the cause of *rightness* is steadily advancing, and that, although for a little season the billows may seem to recede, the great tide of human amelioration is steadily coming up. The present confusion of political parties, the mutual collision and destruction of political pretences, confirm our belief. The trifling statesmen who have played with the weal of man, and have aimed to guide the vessel of state merely for the wages of helmsmen, are losing their hold upon the public mind. Corruption and dishonesty are reaping their proper fruits. In the war of masks, every advantage obtained by this one over that, and that over another, must fall at last to the lot of simple truth. The empty pitchers, borne on headlong by the same stream of necessity, are jostling against, chipping, and cracking each other. Hurrah! They cannot sink too soon!

DESCRIPTION OF THE PREMIER.—It is amusing to see O'Connell's new-born admiration of the Premier, strangely mingled in it as are the terms of eulogy and the essence of scorn. With what intense contempt, and at the same time with what truth, he builds his hopes on Sir Robert's inconsistencies. "Peel is in a wheeling humour, he is spinning round and round, and no one knows on what letter the teetotum may fall." The Lord of Turnabout is indeed in his favourite field. Spinning is in the blood; his father spun cotton, and the son spins himself, and the minister, like the teetotum, only stands while it turns round and round.—*Examiner*.

THE AUTOCRAT MINISTER.—The Maynooth measure, like nearly all of the Premier's, may be referred to himself alone. The author does not sympathise with the nation—does not communicate with it—does not teach and train it—does not forewarn and prepare it—does not give it a share in the triumph, the credit, the profit, of his measures. It is his object to render it Sir R. Peel's, as much as to give his livery to his servants, and his crest to his carriages. The patient is welcome to die a thousand deaths, so long as Dr Peel is not in sole possession of the bedside. "But what will you advise as a friend?" his rivals have frequently asked. "Do you object to this treatment?—Is there any harm in that course?" They ask in vain. The doctor mumbles his gold-headed cane, declines the cold honours of unprofessional attendance, and waits for the approach of some mortal agony, when he must be called in.

Sir Robert has constituted himself the *Æolus* of conflicting sects. He is riding a storm of denominations, whose rough blasts he may, perhaps, counterpoise, but may also be made to feel. Whatever be the follies and even the vices of protestantism, in its thousand and one British varieties, the sentiment is almost ineradicable, and is, in fact, whatever it be by right, the trial of British faithfulness.—*Times*.

BIGAMY.—A man, named Peel, was yesterday brought before the magistrate, Mr Bull, at this office,

charged with having intermarried with a female named Free Trade, his former wife, Agricultura, being still alive. Their graces the Dukes of Buckingham and Richmond, and a gentleman named Ferrand, proved the fact of the former marriage; but, upon cross examination, admitted a doubt as to whether Agricultura was still living, intimating their suspicion that she had been destroyed by the ill-treatment of her husband. A Mr Cobden deposed that Peel (who holds a high situation under royalty) had, within the last two years, contracted matrimony with Free Trade, a young lady to whom he was himself engaged. He complained bitterly of Peel as having stolen his sweetheart. The editors of the *Standard* and *Morning Herald* gave the prisoner an excellent character; but the disinterestedness of their testimony appeared very questionable. Mr Bull said that the fact of the two marriages had been distinctly proved, and was highly discreditable to the prisoner; but as there was a doubt as to whether the former wife was in existence, he regretted that could do nothing with the case, and cautioned the prisoner not to let him see him there again.—*Punch*.

HER MAJESTY'S DRAWING ROOM.—Her Majesty held her first drawing room for the season at St James's palace, on Thursday; and, notwithstanding the cold state of the weather, a large crowd had assembled in the park before one o'clock, and waited with the greatest patience to obtain a glimpse of the Sovereign. The general company was exceedingly numerous, and presented a very brilliant spectacle. Her Majesty and Prince Albert, who appeared in excellent health and spirits, were loudly cheered.

Alterations are about to be made in the General Post office, in St Martin's-le-grand, with a view to the enlarged accommodation required by the increase of business. A new money-order office is to be erected in Aldersgate street; and the rooms now occupied by this department in the Post-office will be appropriated to enlarging the London district office.

THE SCREW VICTORIOUS.—Trials have recently been instituted by the Admiralty to test the comparative advantages of the paddle-wheel and screw-propeller for steam vessels; the contest lying between the Rattler, fitted with the screw, and the Alecto, with paddles. The Rattler uniformly beat, in races, both in fair and foul weather; but the most conclusive proof as to the superiority of the screw was given when, the vessels being fastened to each other with their heads in opposite directions, the Rattler towed the Alecto, in spite of all her attempts to run away astern, at the rate of two miles and a half an hour.

The repeal of the duty on glass has commenced. Before the repeal, a square of the best sheet glass of 6 inches by 4 was charged 1s. 5d.: it is now selling for 1d. The patent plate, which before the alteration was selling at 2s. 6d. a square of the dimensions stated, is now selling for 1s. 7d.

The national debt commissioners have given notice of their intention to apply £839,026 7s., being one-fourth of the surplus of income over expenditure for the year ending the 5th of January last, to the reduction of the national debt.

A return of the aggregate number of stamps supplied to the newspapers of the United Kingdom, in 1842, 1843, and 1844, has been made to the House of Commons. We give the numbers (exclusive of stamps consumed for supplements):—

	1842	1843	1844
England	50,145,912	51,282,900	53,933,848
Wales	440,200	456,925	479,700
Scotland	4,977,344	5,293,724	5,727,585
Ireland	6,063,906	6,425,076	6,769,067

In every division of the kingdom, it will be observed, there has been a progressive increase in the newspaper circulation.

OMINOUS SYMPTOMS.—The *Caledonia* steamer was detained two days in order to carry out to America the debate on the Oregon question; and by the same packet instructions were forwarded to the governors of our North American colonies to hold themselves prepared for every emergency. Two additional companies of Royal Artillery are under orders for embarkation to Canada, as a reinforcement, not as a relief. It is further said that the naval station in the Cork river will be made the rendezvous, as on former similar occasions, for the troops to hold themselves in readiness. The Dublin correspondent of the *Chronicle* writes, "I have learned that several regiments are to be drawn from Ireland during the next month. The *Evening Post* mentions a rumour that 8,000 troops are to be sent to Canada."

THE NAVY.—We understand that orders have been issued by the Admiralty to discontinue raising men for the navy.—*Shipping Gazette*.

AN AWKWARD BLUNDER.—A valuable collection of books, presented by the French Chamber of Deputies to the Congress at Washington, has just been sold by auction at the Custom house of New York, to defray the duties, which no party had taken the trouble to satisfy. It is well this national slight was not perpetrated on the banks of the Thames; we should have found it no easy matter to purge ourselves of that contempt in the eyes of our irritable neighbours. It will, probably, create no great sereness, happening where it has,—the Senate having taken the necessary steps to disavow all participation in the insult on the part of the Americans or their representatives, and the press being unanimous in its indignation. The directing committee of the congressional library has been ordered to investigate

the cause and authors of this singular mistake, to reclaim the books, and to offer thanks and explanations to the French government.—*Manchester Guardian*.

REVOLUTIONARY CORRESPONDENCE.—Since the English government has assumed the office of a political detective police for all the states of Europe, it must leave no means untried to procure exact information. The knowledge that letters are liable to be examined at the Post-office, will necessarily drive conspirators to employ other means of communication. An obvious channel is the mysterious telegraph system of advertisements in the newspapers. These puzzling announcements begin already to betray a political under-meaning. For example, in the *Times* of Tuesday last we saw—

"Yours, &c., No. 12. (Stopped by order from Le Père). Nothing whatever has arrived here from you, save what you have sent me from M— and M—'s. All depends on your fidelity and courage."

To any skilful expounder of ciphers this presents no difficulty. "Le Père," by whose orders the letter was stopped, is obviously the Home Secretary; "No. 12," some secret committee, to which is intrusted the guidance of an organised conspiracy; and the allusion to fidelity and courage points beyond a doubt to an impending revolutionary attempt. The Home Secretary, however, needs not issue a warrant to open every copy of the *Times* that passes through the Post-office; it will be quite sufficient if he read attentively that one which is taken in at his own office in Downing street.—*Spectator*.

A letter in the *Avenir* announces that Mr Pritchard and family had reached St Thomas's, and were about to embark in the steamer for Panama, cross the isthmus, and thus reach the Friendly Islands.

INCREASE OF SPEED ON THE SOUTHAMPTON RAILWAY.—It is the intention of the directors of the Southampton railway, that the speed of the mail trains on their line shall be increased, and a plan has been projected, by which the distance between London and Southampton will be accomplished in two hours, instead of two hours and forty minutes, the time now occupied in the journey. It is expected that the alteration will take place in about three weeks.

IRELAND.

MR O'CONNELL ON THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.—We take a few extracts from Mr O'Connell's remarks on this subject at the last meeting of the Repeal Association, which we were able to notice only briefly in our last number. Mr O'Connell thus lauds the measure:—

I proclaim that there was never yet, as far as I can understand it, and the speech that preceded it, a measure which was brought in on fairer terms than that introduced by Sir R. Peel with reference to Maynooth. But is that to make us give up the agitation? (cries of "No.") (A voice—"We will die first.") (cheers.) I don't mean to quarrel with any one who differs in opinion with me on any subject, still less am I inclined to quarrel with any person who thinks, with me, that it was the repeal agitation that produced this change in Sir Robert Peel (cheers). Agitation, I thank you (cheers). Conciliation hall, I am obliged to you (cheers). Repeal Association, Maynooth ought to pray for you (loud cheering). There was a story told of the officers of the Irish brigade:—As long as a young man, who came into the French army as cadet, conducted himself well, he was left a cadet; so they always found it necessary to become a little riotous to get promoted to the rank of officer (laughter). We in the Conciliation hall represent the officer—the Irish cadets understand the *policy of misconducting themselves*. This is a boon to us to misbehave in future, and we are too honest not to give them the price for their money. When they tell us that we should thank Sir R. Peel and his 200 myrmidons, that go with him from one side of the House to the other, I say, thank the Conciliation hall and agitation. There is one thing that is delightful. It was on Thursday he brought in the Maynooth bill, and passed it by a majority of 102. On Thursday he brought in that bill, and made his conciliatory speech, and he immediately took advantage of it, and the next day, Friday, he set the Americans at defiance, naturally feeling that he was strong in doing justice to Ireland (cheers); and I tell him to go on in the same career, and we will set the Americans at defiance for him also (hear, hear).

The Agitator then gives vent to the cry of "Hurrah, then, for Peel and Repeal!" and argues the point thus:—

I think that we may begin to expect that the act of union will be repealed. I cannot bring myself to think that Sir Robert Peel himself may not be the very man to bring in the act for its repeal. Hurrah, then for Peel and repeal! Who is it will tell me that Sir R. Peel will not do it? When you talk of a man's future conduct, the best grounds on which to conjecture what that shall be, is to look at his past conduct; and is there anything in what may be called the antecedents of Sir R. Peel that is inconsistent with his bringing in an act of parliament for the repeal of the union himself? Was there ever, I ask, so determined an enemy of catholic emancipation as Sir Robert Peel—conscientiously, I admit, but still a little usefully to himself; for it was by taking the ground of no popery in his early political life, that he—the son of a manufacturer—a manufacturer of high character, certainly—has risen to the dignity of premier of England!

Mr O'Connell's practice as opposed to his principles.

The Maynooth grant may seem an infringement on this principle, and most assuredly I would not consent to it were it not that I regard it as a restitution of a part of their own property to the catholic population of this country. Relieve the catholics of Ireland from the burden of contributing to the support of the protestant church, and I will throw you back your thirty thousand a year (hear). I support the grant now because it is a modification of an existing evil—I support it because it is a measure of restitution, but I am not the less deeply attached to the principle that every persuasion should be at liberty to worship God as they thought fit (hear).

Imperial Parliament.
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS FOR THE WEEK.

Agriculture, for relief of, 8.
Banking (Scotland), against alteration of system, 4.
County Courts, for establishment of, 11.
Education (Ireland), for removing restrictions on, 96.
Factories, for restricting labour in, 8.
Field Gardens bill, for, 2.
Game Laws, for abolition of, 2.
Mill Coolies, against importation of, 9.
Insolvent Debtors act, for repeal of, 11.
Interments in Towns, against, 3.
Lord's Day, for the better observance of, 19.
Malt Tax, for repeal of, 11.
Maynooth College, against grant to, 3,940.
Ministers' Money (Ireland), for abolition of, 1.
Museums of Art bill, for, 8.
Naval Force, against increase of, 5.
Parochial Settlements bill, against 50.
Poor Law, for amendment of, 2.
Public Houses, for diminishing the number of, 106.
Punishment of Death, for abolition of, 1.
Schoolmasters (Scotland), for ameliorating their condition, 14.
St Asaph and Bangor Dioceses, against union of, 46.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME.

Sugar (Excise Duties) bill.
Auction Duties Repeal bill.
Statute Labour (Scotland) bill.
Chattel Interests (Real Property) bill.

BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

Field Gardens bill.
Auction Duties Repeal bill.
Sugar (Excise Duties) bill.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Mutiny bill.
Infestation (Scotland) bill.
Heritable Securities (Scotland) bill.
Callie Print Works bill.
Auction Duties Repeal bill.
Sugar (Excise Duties) bill.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED.

Public Museums, &c., bill.
Glass (Excise Duty) bill.
Mutiny bill.

DEBATES.

Wednesday, April 9th.

FIELD GARDENS.

The second reading of the Field Gardens bill was opposed by Mr Escott, as arbitrary and oppressive. The field-wardens to be appointed under the bill were armed with the most preposterous powers. The rights of the owner of land seemed utterly thrown aside; he was neither to be allowed any discretion as to what rent he was to have, nor what quantity he was to let to a man; for the warden, or the commissioner under the Enclosure act, or the quarter-sessions, was arbitrarily to set a price on the land; and, moreover, no man was to be permitted to have more than half an acre.

Mr Cowper defended the measure. The objections urged by Mr Escott would be much better considered in committee; and, so far was the bill from being compulsory, that it would depend on the choice of parishes to adopt it or not.

The motion was supported by Mr Monckton Milnes, Sir James Graham, Lord John Manners, and Mr John Stuart Wortley; opposed by Mr Bouverie, and Mr Beckett Denison.

On a division, the second reading was carried, by 92 to 18.

Thursday, April 10th.

THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.

A conversation of some interest took place on the mode of procedure to be adopted in respect to the Maynooth grant.

Sir Charles Napier had observed the absence of two gentlemen [Mr Fitzroy and Captain Meynell] who held office under government from the division of last week; were they absent by design or accident? if by design, were they still members of government? and if so, was the question to be considered an "open" one?

Sir Robert Peel replied thus:—

I cannot take upon myself to say whether those honourable gentlemen to whom the honourable and gallant member has referred were absent by accident or design. I beg to say that there has been no change recently in the members of her Majesty's government; therefore, it is clear that there can be no removals on this account. With respect to Maynooth, I consider that to be a government question. I consider it to be one of the utmost importance, and I shall do everything in my power to promote its success. [Sir Robert, says the report in the *Morning Post*, spoke in a low voice and with some emotion in making this announcement; which was received with loud cheers by the opposition, and in perfect silence by the conservative side of the House.]

In reply to Mr Hume, Mr Ward stated how he meant to proceed with his amendment [asserting that provision for education in Ireland should be made out of ecclesiastical funds].

When he gave notice of his motion, he never intended that it should be made a rallying-point for all those who wished to oppose the government measure. Though a member of that House for twelve years, he was not ashamed to confess that he was until to-day scandalously ignorant of the form in which the question was to be put. As he now understood, the question which the Speaker would put from the chair, in case he pressed his amendment, would be, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question;" and in that case he had reason to believe his amendment would be made the point on which the government measure would be opposed. He must say, that he did not wish to encourage or aggravate the angry feeling which was rapidly rising out of doors, by procuring a large minority for the first portion of his amendment; and, having to choose between the loss of the government bill, which loss he must look on as a grievous calamity, and the abandonment of his motion, he had made up his mind to withdraw the latter for the present [opposition cheers]. He would again

bring it forward on whatever stage of the bill he could obtain a fair, free, and intelligent expression of the sense of the House.

Mr Charles Hindley said, that if Mr Ward, with all his experience, needed delay, there were other reasons for postponing the second reading:—

He appealed to the Speaker. He wished to ask the Speaker why the members of that House were required to put their names in the corner of every petition? Were they not, by the spirit of that order, required to read every petition, in order to know that the prayers of them were respectfully addressed to that House? He had not had time to read every petition entrusted to him [pointing to a huge heap of petitions, lying on the bench beside him]; he, therefore, could not present them. While he would not desire to interfere with the government or with the business of the House, he asked for time to enable him to discharge his duty conscientiously.

Sir Robert Peel saw no reason for delay, and he should certainly move the second reading on Friday. There would be other opportunities for contesting the principle of the bill:—

Before we can proceed, the House must resolve itself into committee of the whole House, for the purpose of rejecting or sanctioning the proposal I shall make with respect to the grant to Maynooth. I should think it improbable that that motion would be made *before to-morrow week*; consequently, there will be an opportunity for those who are opposed to the principle of the bill again to take the sense of the House, even previously to going into the general committee on the bill. Under these circumstances, I think it will not be thought unreasonable if I force the second reading to-morrow.

STATE OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITIES.

Mr Christie drew attention to the state of the two great universities, moving:—

"That an humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that she would be graciously pleased to appoint a commission to inquire into and report upon all matters relating to the privileges, revenues, trusts, and to the state of education, learning, and religion, in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the colleges of these universities."

He enforced the necessity of inquiry in a speech of great length. He first described the wealth of the two universities, and the aid they receive from the state: parliament annually votes £2,006 to the two universities for the salaries of professors, besides several other smaller sums contributed by the Crown. He calculated that, in seven years, Cambridge made £5,000 profit, and Oxford £7,000, by their share in the bible monopoly; to Oxford is remitted yearly about £2,731 of paper duty—to Cambridge, £3,243; they enjoy the privilege of copyright in perpetuity for works which they publish; the 305 livings of which Cambridge has the patronage are worth about £113,300; the 447 livings of Oxford about £173,000. As to the right of government to inquire, he cited the commissions issued in 1826 and 1830 to inquire into the state of the Scotch universities. He proceeded to adduce testimony to prove the necessity of changes. At both universities the attendance of students at the classes of the several professors is so scanty, that the professorships are fast dwindling into sinecures; the number of pupils ranging from twenty-five or so, down to six, five, two, or even to one! At Oxford, where there is a professorship of civil law, richly endowed, there are neither lectures nor examinations; yet the universities claim for the degrees which they confer exclusive right to practise in the ecclesiastical and admiralty courts! In Oxford they do not even profess to give medical education; yet the university confers degrees in medicine. However, while in ten years Oxford has conferred 22 degrees of doctor of medicine, and Cambridge 51, the university of London has conferred 33 in six years. It has been urged against the admission of dissenters, that the universities are seminaries of theology: Dr Thirlwall, bishop of St David's, declared that that assertion is a mere fiction; and, in 1833, Dr Pusey said, with respect to the theological studies at the university of Oxford, that "one fortnight comprised the beginning and the end of all the public instruction which any candidate for holy orders was required to attend previous to entering upon his profession." By the bye, Dr Pusey, who has been the object of attack and ridicule, has shown the sincerity of his zeal in the improvement of theological education by a munificent foundation of Hebrew scholarships. The Crown has founded two new professorships at Oxford; but the examination was not made compulsory, and what were the numbers of those who offered themselves for examination? In the first half year, 1; in the next, 0; and in the third, 2! It may be said that, if Oxford and Cambridge are not theological seminaries, they are not exclusively church of England places. But is it politic to attempt to "crib, cabin, and confine" the theology of the universities within the limits of the thirty-nine articles? The result has been, that learning has burst from the fetters which encircled her, and that tractarianism has shaken the church of England to its centre. Dr Pusey, digging up an old statute, re-organised the Board of Heresy, and excluded Dr Hampden; then the Board of Heresy turned round, convicted Dr Pusey himself of heresy, suspended him from preaching for two years in Christchurch, of which he was a canon; leaving him, however, at full range to preach where he pleased, and that was in the diocese of Exeter. Dr Hampden then convicted Mr M'Mullen of heterodoxy; but has not been able to prevent him from continuing a heterodox member of an orthodox college. The university has deprived Mr Ward of his degrees, because he declared that he signed the thirty-nine articles in a "non-natural" sense; but it has not on that account been able to deprive him of his functions as a clergyman of the church of England. Puseyism cannot be crushed by making martyrs of its votaries; let the same indulgence be extended to every other "ism," and make Puseyism innocuous by depriving it of singularity. Mr Christie

exposed the absurdity of the distinctions of rank—the delay of seven years before a plebeian can be master of arts of Cambridge, while persons of noble or royal blood can obtain the degree in two years, as if there were a noble road to learning!—distinctions of dress—the nobleman's golden tuft at Oxford, the game of the "tuft-hunter"—the nobleman's purple and gold gown at Cambridge—"picta pandit spectacula cauda"—worn half a dozen times, and becoming the perquisite of his college tutor; the fines for non-attendance in chapel, making an alternative between prayers and payments; the distinctions of table, &c. In 1837, the chancellors of both the universities made promises to Lord Radnor, in parliament, that the colleges should revise their statutes: at Cambridge, five colleges have done so; at Oxford, none. Mr Christie appealed to the Premier, to whom all the recent great triumphs of religious liberty are owing, not to refuse inquiry. He appealed even to Sir Robert Inglis himself, member for the university of Oxford:—

He must see that this question is now in a very different position from what it was when it was last agitated in this House ten years ago—when Puseyism was a name unknown—when Tract No. 90 was yet unwritten—when no one had ventured to whisper even, much less to commit to irrevocable print, that he subscribed the articles in a non-natural sense: and his strong sense of justice must recoil from a system which harbours Roman catholic conformity and proscribes protestant dissenters—which complacently sees college rooms fitted up with confessional, and shops in Oxford filled with rosaries and crucifixes to slake the Roman catholic thirst of the protestant youth of Oxford, but has not yet proposed any restitution of her old monastic cloisters, fit even for the education of a Roman catholic priesthood, so that you are compelled to propose additional endowments for Maynooth—which has no open relations with Rome, but is in close alliance with the pope of Newmania at Littlemore—which admits Mr Newman and Mr Oakeley, and excludes Dr Wiseman and Dr Lingard. He asked, how the universities had fulfilled their duties as stewards of the nation's philosophical and literary renown? Once they monopolised all learning, when all learning consisted in Aristotle. And how long after Bacon's great work did Aristotle linger in the schools? How is Oxford or Cambridge connected with the Augustan age of our literature? Of whom could they boast when Edinburgh could exhibit Lestie, Playfair, Gregory, and Dugald Stewart? At the present day, in speculative philosophy, the chief men, such as Mr Bailey of Sheffield, and Mr John Mill, a public servant from an early age to the court of East India directors, are unconnected with the universities. In science and literature, the dissenting protestants, Dr Faraday, Dr Pye Smith, and others—in history, the catholic Dr Lingard—have been excluded from the universities. Mr Christie alluded to the unequivocal signs of weariness exhibited by the Queen when she recently witnessed some of the antiquated ceremonies at Cambridge; and hoped that she had then conceived the desire to exercise the power which the law gives her of infusing new life and vigour into the seats of learning.

Sir Robert Inglis (the member for Oxford university) opposed the motion. He admitted the right of the Crown to issue the commission: he acknowledged the wealth of the universities; but it certainly is not on account of the enormous contributions of the state that Mr Christie could claim the visitatorial powers of the crown, for in no country does the state give so small a proportion of its income for the support of learning; and no abuse had been shown in the disposal of the funds to render inquiry necessary. The object of the present measure was to force ulterior measures on the universities. It is the pre-eminence of the two universities that attracts attention; for he defied Mr Christie to show, within the last three centuries, any distinguished man who was unconnected with either of the two universities. The pledge given to Lord Radnor had not been neglected: the statutes in Oxford are in course of revision, and sixteen of the twenty-one "titles" have been revised; but though the governing body can revise, it cannot alter the statutes—a power which rests with convocation; and unless Mr Christie could prove the Crown to have the power of enforcing alteration, the inquiry would be nugatory. Nothing but an act of parliament could override and overthrow the power of convocation. Sir Robert combated at much length the position that the universities are accountable for their property as having been derived from Roman catholics; the greater number of fellowships and livings are of protestant foundation; of the professorships, but one at Oxford and but one in four at Cambridge, were founded by catholics. After replying to other points of Mr Christie's speech, he concluded by declaring that no case had been made out for the motion.

Mr Goulburn (member for Cambridge university) followed with similar arguments against the motion. As a member of the government he objected to resorting to commissions to gratify individual curiosity or individual difference of opinion; for putting upon trial implies censure in the first instance; and although the methods of education at English and continental universities may be fair subjects for deliberation and comparison among literary men, they do not warrant the interposition of parliament. Such an inquiry would unsettle the minds of the professors, disturb the studies of the scholars, and perhaps produce even lasting ill effects. Nor have improvements been neglected at Cambridge; certain oaths have been abrogated, and an inoffensive declaration substituted; and the statutes are undergoing revision.

Mr Ewart, Mr Wyse, Mr Hume, and Lord Palmerston spoke in support of the motion; Mr Alex. Hope against it.

On a division, the motion was negatived by 143 to 82; majority 61.

Friday, April 11th.

THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.

Sir R. PEEL having moved the second reading of the Maynooth College bill, Mr COLQUHOUN, repeating many arguments against the measure—the democratic and agitating tendencies of Maynooth, the inevitable following of ulterior endowments for the Roman catholic church, and so forth—moved that the bill be read a second time that day six months.

Mr GROGAN followed to the same effect, with an emphatic warning of the danger of encouraging the Jesuits in Ireland.

Mr GLADSTONE then rose. He excused himself for not having delivered his opinion on the measure at the earliest opportunity, by the necessity of seeing the printed bill and maturing his judgment. In spite, however, of the formidable difficulties which attended the introduction of the measure, he was prepared to give it his deliberate support.

I fully admit to my hon. friend that the minority of last week did represent the general and prevailing sense of the majority of the people of England and Scotland [cheers]. But, making that admission, and believing, indeed, that the fact is too notorious to admit of denial or doubt, at the same time I must state, on my own part, that after my full and mature consideration of this subject, in the position in which it stands, *I am prepared, in opposition to what I believe to be the prevailing opinion of the people of England and Scotland—in opposition to the sense of my own constituents, from whom I deeply regret to differ—and in opposition to my own deep, cherished predilections—I am prepared to give a deliberate and anxious support to the measure of my right hon. friend [loud and continued cheering from the opposition].*

The reasons hitherto given for the bill appeared to him however to be quite inadequate—unreal and unsubstantial. He could not agree with Sir Robert Peel in resting his support on any “compact;” for although the annual grant rested on a compact which did somewhat fetter the discretion of parliament, this was a question, not of an annual grant, but of a permanent endowment—not merely of an increase of money, but of reinstating the college. *It was a new measure.* He could not agree that it was an act of restitution—for if so, how paltry a return of a shilling or sixpence in the pound! He supported the bill, because he felt confident that whatever tends to give dignity and ease to the professors of Maynooth college would have a material influence in softening the tone of that institution. He found strong *prima facie* and presumptive arguments in favour of a proposition such as that made by the government, arising out of the numbers of the Roman catholic population in Ireland, their great poverty, and the difficulty they experience in providing themselves with even the common necessities of life: arguments in the favourable concurrence of statesmen of opposite parties, and in the popular doctrine that those who pay taxes should share equally in the benefits resulting from the state. He found additional arguments in the inclination to support it exhibited by all the great statesmen on both sides of the House, and in the fact that those who paid the taxes of a country had a right to share in the benefits of its institutions. Nothing convinced him so much of the validity of the arguments in support of this measure as the paucity and weakness of those urged against it by its opponents. They said that this experiment of Maynooth was an experiment of Mr Pitt's, and that it had been fairly tried, and had signally failed. But they forgot that the original view of Mr Pitt was, that the Roman catholic clergy of Ireland should not only be trained in the college of Maynooth, but that they should also have a subsequent provision made for their support. No such provision had been made; and it was most unjust to say that Mr Pitt's experiment had failed, when, in point of fact, it had only been partially tried. He thought that there were cases in which such a grant might be properly withheld; but, on the other hand, he thought that those who deemed it contrary to religious duty to make it, confounded the principles on which they would act in their private capacities, with those on which men must act in a combined society:—

With respect to those who say, on the other hand, that it is contrary to religious duty to make such a grant, I think that they confound the principle on which persons may act in their individual capacity, with the principle on which they must act when combined in political society. In his individual capacity, a man's will and conscience may take their way. He may betray and abandon them if he chooses; but no other person can force him to do so. But political society can exist only by a combination of a multitude of wills, by mutual concessions and surrenders; and if every man were to insist for himself that his own opinions, whatever they may be, and no other, should be recognised in the laws of the state, the result would be that all society would be thrown into utter confusion [hear, hear].

Exclusive support to the church had long been abandoned by the state, and was in progress of further abandonment every day. Looking at the heterogeneous character of the opposition to the Maynooth bill, he did not see on what broad principle of justice they could reject it:—

Here is my hon. friend (Sir R. Inglis), who would consistently stand on the principle on which I would also stand, were it not for the convictions and state of the country—namely, exclusive adherence to the national religion. But in what a position will my hon. friend be, if he succeeds in rejecting this bill? Among what companions, and with what followers, will he find himself [hear, hear]? One-half of those by whom he would be supported would protest against religious endowment of every kind [hear, hear]. Even that is not all the difficulty, but a large proportion of the rest of his supporters, though they are not prepared to abjure the principle of religious endowment altogether, would still refuse to follow my hon. friend in his principle of supporting the church of England alone; and they would tell him that, though they had conscientious objections to the Roman catholic religion, they are nevertheless prepared to support all forms of protestantism.

To get rid of a motion proposed by government is one thing, but to establish a positive principle for government is a very different thing. It is very easy to form a combination—I do not say that it may not be perfectly honourable to do so—but, at all events, it is very easy, by an accidental conjunction with those from whom you differ, to form a combination effectual for the immediate purpose of rejecting a particular measure; but when you come to ask yourselves on what principles the country is to be governed, and what answer you are to make to the people of Ireland for the course you have pursued, then a new order of ideas comes into your mind, and difficulties start up before you in gigantic magnitude. *If you take the course of rejecting this measure, you ought to be able to declare to the people of Ireland some definite and intelligible principle.* It is not enough to say that you reject this or that measure; you must show that you have some intelligible rule which the mass of men can comprehend [hear, hear].

Seeing, then, that there were no just grounds for excluding the Roman catholics on account of their religion from the bounty of the state, he proceeded to explain the reasons why he considered the boon now extended to them as very great. It was important for the principles it contained, for it decided, not indeed the maintenance of the Roman catholic clergy in Ireland by the state, but the principle on which that maintenance rested.

The Earl of ARUNDEL had listened with great gratification to the speech of Mr Gladstone, and congratulated Sir Robert Peel on now having on his side every statesman in the House who deserved the name. The catholics of England viewed with applause and delight the boon which Sir Robert Peel had extended to their brethren in religion in Ireland. He regretted that the speeches of the opponents of this measure should be filled with such obsolete and exploded errors as to the tenets of the Roman catholic religion:—

The honourable gentleman (Mr Colquhoun) opposed the grant because he opposed the religion [hear, hear]; and that was the gist of all the argument advanced amid this no-papery cry. The honourable gentleman who held this language disclaimed all desire to persecute for religion's sake; but they were animated with the same spirit which, had they lived some centuries ago, would have shown itself in bitter persecution. Two centuries ago, had they both lived then, the honourable member for Kent would have wished to burn him [a laugh]. Perhaps he would have wished in turn to burn the honourable member [renewed laughter]—and perhaps somebody else would have burnt the survivor—an act which could have been performed, perhaps, with no great loss to society [loud laughter]. Nay more! Had the honourable member for Kent been born eighteen hundred years ago, and not a Gentile, but an Israelite [a laugh]—had he been so born and brought up, he would, it was obvious from the frame of mind which he exhibited, have been as clear for the impeachment of Pontius Pilate as the honourable member for Knaresborough was for that of the Prime Minister [loud laughter]. He did not wish to mention the honourable member for Kent invidiously; but his speech had been the most overcharged with attacks upon the religion which he professed, and the most decided in accusing him of idolatry.

Mr D'ISRAELI observed that, in listening to the speech of Mr Gladstone, he had wondered in his own mind what had led Mr Gladstone to pass below the gangway to deliberate on this measure. He had next wondered why Mr Gladstone had crossed the House to deliberate upon the principles of it, and had pursued the course which he had followed whilst in opposition. Mr Gladstone had explained the reason by stating that the principle on which the connexion of church and state rested was worn out, and that her Majesty's government had just discovered that to be the fact. But, if such were the case, had there been no public men in that House who had previously advocated the new principle now propounded by Mr Gladstone? Did not the members of the late administration discover it, and had not opposition to it been considered as the foundation of the conservative theory? It had been said, “You have endowed the Anglican church, why will you not endow the Roman catholic church?” But that was an evasion of the question; for the real question was, “Did we endow the Anglican church?” He, for one, denied it; and, unless that position was proved, the whole foundation for this measure was cut away from under it. Sir Robert Peel had stated that there were three courses open to the House.

I never knew him bring forward, not what I will call a great measure, but a measure assuming to settle a great controversy—I never knew him, I say, bring forward such a measure, without saying that three courses were open to the House [renewed laughter]. In a certain sense, and looking to his own position, the right honourable gentleman is always so far perfectly right [laughter]. There is the course the right honourable gentleman has left [hear, hear]. There is the course that the right honourable gentleman is following; and there is the course which the right honourable gentleman ought to pursue. Perhaps I may say that there is a fourth course; for it is possible the House of Commons may adopt one of the courses indicated by the right honourable gentleman, and, having voted one way one night, may rescind their resolution on the next [much laughter]. That is the fourth course; in future I trust the right honourable gentleman will not forget it.

On the present occasion he had come forward with a great measure and a small precedent. He had traced the progress of the steam engine back to the teakettle. He (Mr D'Israeli) had hitherto looked up to Mr Gladstone as the abstraction of chivalry, as the Paladin of principle, and had never expected that he would come forward and try this great change of principle by a change of circumstances. He was not certain that the church of England had received additional strength from its union with the state; but if the state would leave the church to itself, it would not shrink from the performance of its duties.

I have that confidence in the church of England, that I believe its connexion with the state is of little importance, and very often it may be a source of injury. It rests on its own foundation, and not on the endowment of the state. Leave the church of England to itself, and

it will not shrink from the contest to which it may be exposed. I believe in Ireland, at this moment, if it became a question, “Will you endow the catholic church, or sever the connexion between the protestant church and the state?” the Irish protestants would say, “Sever the connexion” [hear]. But if the connexion is given up, are you bound to adopt a pantheistic principle? Are you bound to say, “Whatever are your religious opinions, send them to Downing street, and it will supply you with a spiritual cure.” I have no confidence in Downing street. It has shown a great disposition of late to interfere in everything. It has assailed our parochial constitution, and taken a great deal on itself in every way never intended by our forefathers. Are you prepared, on a superficial pretence of sympathy for the Roman catholics, to which all must respond, to admit a principle of such importance as that I have suggested? I am totally opposed to it. I can conceive nothing more foreign to the customs, manners, and convictions of the people of this country, than a police surveillance over their creeds and ceremonies. I deny altogether that the church of England is the creature of the state. The alliance is on equal terms [hear, hear]; and if there was a minister of instruction in this country who interfered with ecclesiastical details in the same way that the French or Prussian minister does, I am certain the people of England would never submit to it. He would oppose the bill, not only on principle, but on account of the manner in which, and of the men by whom, it was brought forward. When he remembered the appropriation clause, he thought it perfectly monstrous, that because ministers had been enabled to cross the House by opposing it, they should now feel themselves at liberty to say, “Forget us, and look at our measure.” Had this bill been brought forward by Lord J. Russell and his colleagues, it would have been checked by the operation of a constitutional opposition. At the present moment such an opposition did not exist; and they had a government carrying this measure by an organisation which was framed for the express purpose of opposing it. Some years ago they had been accustomed to toast with three times three, and with nine times nine, the independence of the House of Lords. But conservatism and a conservative dictator had reduced the independence of the House of Lords to comparative insignificance. Would the House of Commons consent to be reduced to the same miserable condition?

If you canvass the parliamentary life and political conduct of him who has effected this change, you are recommended to go to railway committees [much laughter]. You may break the spirit of another place, and lower the tone in this house; another place may be drilled into a guard room, and the House of Commons may be degraded into a vestry; but the consequences will be exactly similar. When bills for endowing Maynooth, and for paying the priesthood (for that is admitted to be the effect of the present measure), are submitted to you—when the floor of this house is covered with petitions, and the lobby of the other thronged with those who despair of redress from you—when you have an administration without distinct principles, and an opposition that does not oppose, the nation would reject as utterly unworthy of its confidence a scheme of government so adroitly fashioned, yet so worthless for all the purposes for which governments were devised. If you had a real parliamentary administration, you must have, as a condition, the check of a constitutional opposition. But what have you got instead? There has risen up in this country a character that has proved fatal to the landed interest of Ireland. You have a great parliamentary middleman [roars of laughter]. You all know what a middleman is. He is one who bamboozles one party and plunders another, till, having attained a position he is not entitled to, he cries out, “Let us have no party questions, but fixity of tenure” [renewed laughter]. I want a committee of inquiry into the tenure by which Downing street is held. I want to know the conditions which have not been observed, and if there are not covenants in the lease which have already been forfeited. I hope I am not to be answered by Hansard [much laughter]. I am not surprised the right hon. gentleman should be so fond of recurring to that great authority. He can look over the records of thirty years and more of an eminent career; but that is not the lot of every one. But after all, one tires even of one's own speeches. “Hansard” must sometimes appear nothing more than dry pages of interminable talk. What predictions we there see falsified, and what pledges broken! What calculations that have gone wrong, what budgets that have blown up! [laughter]—and all this not relieved by a single generous emotion, original thought, or happy expression [renewed laughter].

“Hansard,” indeed! though it may be the Delphi of Downing street, may be well characterised as the Dunciad of politicians. It serves at least to illustrate a system in which measures are propounded on matters of fact. Yet how fallacious—taking everybody in, though everybody knows he is deceived—so mechanical, and yet so Machiavellian, that I can hardly describe it except by saying that it a species of *hocus pocus*, which enables its great master, while moving the order of the day, to take in the nation [cheers and laughter].

It had been said that this was a liberal boon to the Roman catholic clergy of Ireland. It was not so. It was a paltry, meagre, miserable gift, unworthy of us to give, and of them to accept. It was a question whether the Roman catholic students of theology should have £23 or £28 a year, and whether they should sleep three, or only two, in a bed. But even if it had been a princely gift, it was not from the polished hand of him whose bleak shade had arrested the boon of catholic emancipation for twenty-five years that the Roman catholics of Ireland ought to receive it. As to the whigs, he despaired of making any appeal with success to their hereditary convictions, otherwise he should have thought that Lord J. Russell, with his high character and still higher aspirations, would have been tired ere now of being dragged at the wheels of the triumphal car of conqueror who had not conquered him in fair fight. Enough had transpired of late to convince the most incredulous statesman that cunning was not caution, and that habitual perfidy was not high policy of state. On that ground he sought to bring back to the House the salutary check of a constitutional

opposition; and it could only be done by putting an end to the dynasty of deception and to the prevailing system of parliamentary imposture.

Mr Roebuck considered the present to be a great national question, and expressed his indignation that the important considerations connected with it should be merged in the private pique of petty personalities. The speech of Mr D'Israeli had not sufficient talent to excuse its open malice: it was poor in performance, however malicious it might be in intention. It was something to be praised by a man worthy of praise, but it was monstrous to be accused of inconsistency by one who was not himself above the suspicion of inconsistency. He then proceeded to declare his readiness to support this grant, even had it been a new grant. The only objection which he had to it was, that it was insignificant, and did not go far enough. He thus referred to the nature of the opposition which the measure encountered out of doors:—

There were two classes, who differed as to their language and arguments against it: one of these classes he could sympathise with and understand; the arguments of the other party for the most part eluded the grasp of his comprehension. The first class comprehended those who adopted what was called the voluntary system, and objected to making any state religion; and they said—and he coincided with them—that the monster grievance in Ireland was the existence of the church establishment there. They now stated that the setting up a second ecclesiastical establishment would not relieve the country from the evils resulting from the first; and that, although the Roman catholics of Ireland had good ground for complaining of the present church of Ireland, it was not a reason for setting a Roman catholic church by its side. He agreed in the first part of this proposition; but, as regarded the latter part, he contended that the present vote was not an endowment of the Roman catholic church in Ireland, but that it was merely a contribution towards the education of the priesthood—a contribution to teach the only teachers of the Irish people; and viewing it in this light, he viewed it with regret as an inadequate measure. But if, instead of this being a contribution for the education of our fellow-christians, who differed only in points of faith, it had been for a Mahomedan portion of the population of the country, he should have done the same. In other portions of the empire they not only did not object to contribute to teach the doctrines of the Mahomedan faith, but they provided the means for the education of Brahminical priests. They not only did not object to paying for the education of the catholic priesthood in Canada, but they there had endowed that religion by act of parliament, and not one word had been raised against it on the score of a violation of conscience. As to those gentlemen who objected to the grant on the score of religious principles, he was free to confess that, for the most part, their arguments were utterly unintelligible to him. They protested against the grant because, said they, the catholic teaching at Maynooth was a teaching of error, and the state ought not to be instrumental in the spread of error; and their exponent, the Rev. Hugh M'Neill, said that, whatever obscurities there might be in the Bible, there was no doubt that the interpretation put upon the leading principles of faith by the protestants was right, and that of the catholics wrong. He (Mr Roebuck), for one, protested, in his turn, against these gentlemen assuming attributes which belonged alone to the Almighty [hear]. Each man, in his heart and conscience, must be the judge of what he deems the truth, and it is not for any one man, or any class, to arrogate the capacity or the power of determining for others what religious truth is; or to condemn them to the privation of the common rights of citizens, because they may happen to take a different view of the subject [hear, hear].

Lord NORTHLAND briefly expressed his determination to oppose the measure.

On the motion of Mr HAWES, the debate was then adjourned till Monday.

Monday, April 14th.

THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.

Sir R. PEEL having moved the adjourned debate on the second reading of the Maynooth College bill,

Mr HAWES observed, that if the House looked at the increasing number of petitions, it would be warranted in coming to the conclusion that this was a bill of great importance; but if it looked to the bill itself, the House would see that it furnished no grounds for the strength of opposition by which it was assailed, or for the important consequences expected from it. He considered it to be a bill for the promotion of education among the people of Ireland generally, and not for the education of Irish Roman catholic ecclesiastics exclusively. He could not agree in the "no popery" cry which had been raised against it; but the speech delivered by Mr Gladstone on Friday evening had made a great alteration in the grounds on which it was to be supported. Mr Gladstone belonged to a party which was opposed to all alienation of property from the existing church of Ireland; but he now understood from him that this was a religious question, involving the endowment of the Roman catholic church in Ireland. Now, if this bill settled that religious question, it must settle the political question connected with it too. He could not assent to any endowment of the Roman catholic church in Ireland out of British funds until the whole question of the Irish church was brought regularly under the consideration of parliament. He could not consent to the erection of two distinct church establishments in Ireland—the one resting on the landed property of that country, and the other on the consolidated fund. Under these circumstances, he could not assent to the present as an ultimate measure, unless the House looked to the Irish church property as the fund out of which the provision for the Roman catholic church was to come. This feeling would not induce him to vote against the second reading of this bill; but, before going into committee, he should give his vote in support of the motion of which Mr Ward had given notice. In the committee he should make two propositions himself—one, that

the grant to this college should be an annual grant under the control of parliament; and the other, that a stop should be put to that mockery of visitation by certain high officers of the Irish government, provided for in the bill itself. Supposing that the proposition of Mr Ward should be negatived, and that he himself should fail in making the grant annual instead of permanent, he should feel himself at liberty to vote as he might think proper on the third reading of the bill, and to take a comprehensive view of its effect, not only on Irish, but on British politics also.

Sir T. FREMANTLE thought that Mr Hawes had acted rather hastily in taking his view of what he conceived to be the policy of her Majesty's government in regard to the Roman catholics of Ireland from Mr Gladstone, who had quitted the government on this very question. The opposition to it arose from two sources—first, from those who opposed it on religious grounds; and next, from those who, acting on the voluntary principle, opposed the institution of all religious establishments in connexion with the state. He could not agree with the former, because he could not see that any religious principle was violated in supporting this measure, and because he found that they were bound in good faith and in honour to support it, in consequence of a compact to that effect made at the time of the union with the Irish parliament. He could not agree with the latter, because he had not heard any parties propose to abolish this college altogether. He proceeded, at some length, to justify the measure.

Mr FOX MAULE, while pleased to see the altered feeling with respect to Ireland, assigned his reasons for voting against the bill. They were changing a mere annual grant into a permanent one, and they were thus permanently endowing a religious establishment over which they had no control. In this they were acting on a perfectly opposite principle to the one which they had avowed with regard to the free church in Scotland. There they declared that the state could have no connexion with a church which disclaimed its interference; and they threw on the voluntary principle a population which, though the bulk of it was poor, had built 600 churches, and raised about £700,000 for their ecclesiastical purposes. It was in vain to expect that the bill before them would allay agitation, or hope to stop short of an entire endowment of the Roman catholic church—a measure which would be unjust to the bulk of the dissenters of this country. The government might have conciliated that people by equalising the franchise in Ireland with the franchise in Scotland and in England, and by introducing measures to protect the peasantry from the tyranny of their landlords; but, instead of dealing with any such question, it had laid its hands on one which must inevitably lead to religious rancour and animosity.

Lord CASTLEREAGH hoped that the Prime Minister would pursue his course undismayed by any combination or defection of parties.

The O'CONNOR DON, as one of the Roman catholic members of the House, received the measure as an effective one for its purposes, enhanced by the manner in which it was brought forward.

Mr LEFRAY opposed the bill on religious grounds, and because he deemed it a violation of the protestant character of our constitution.

Colonel THOMAS WOOD (Middlesex) supported the bill on the general justice of the case, and regarded it as involving, in common honesty, other measures which would pacify Ireland and cement the union—such as the endowment of the catholic church. In these opinions he differed from many of the most influential and cordial supporters among his constituents; but, whatever might be the consequences, he felt that he violated no pledge, and forfeited no honour, in giving a hearty vote in favour of the present measure.

Sir CHARLES NAPIER likewise differed from many of his constituents; but, in the event of a war, he was not one of those who would enable either France or America to throw a force into catholic Ireland in order to attack protestant England. If he could do it consistently with the orders of the House, he should, after Mr Ward's motion was disposed of, move that it be an instruction to the committee to make provision for the introduction into the bill of a clause enacting that, whenever any protestant parish should be found, on becoming vacant, to contain less than five communicants, its revenues should be paid to the consolidated fund, for the purpose of supporting the Roman catholic college at Maynooth. If Mr Ward's motion should not be carried, he should give his support most cordially to the government.

Mr S. O'BRIEN trusted that Sir R. Peel would answer, before the close of the present debate, this question—"Whether he intended to pay the Roman catholic clergy? and, if he did, to what amount, and from what fund?" Till that question was answered, he must consider this bill in two lights—first, as an isolated measure; and, secondly, as the first of a series of ulterior measures. As an isolated measure, he considered it as totally inadequate to the objects which it professed to accomplish; for if in the college of Maynooth you only taught the students habits which must be outraged, and tastes which must be shocked by the poverty in which they must spend the remainder of their lives, you conferred upon them anything but a boon. As the first of a large series of ulterior measures, he must also meet it with a direct negative; for he was convinced that the party by which he, and others who entertained his opinions, had been returned to parliament, had not given him or them any right to enter upon the consideration of such a subject.

Mr WYNN and Mr COWPER spoke in favour of the measure, Mr GREGORY against it.

Mr MACAULAY, classifying the opponents of the

measure, expressed his surprise at the conduct of those who would have voted for the annual grant of £9,000, yet declared their scruples against the increased grant of £26,000. They would provide a dilapidated chapel, pay professors with wages you would scarcely give a groom; supply students with a less keep than that of a common soldier, and drop their objections provided Maynooth were a shabby establishment. Contrasting this with the magnificence of Oxford and Cambridge; from their magnificent chapels, halls, museums, residences of the professors, and so forth, down to the kitchens, with their excellent ale and buttery; and recollecting from whose munificence we had derived all this, he blushed for the protestantism of the 19th century. But then came forward the other class of reasoners, who insisted that the church of Rome taught error, and that we were not justified in contributing to the propagation of error. He denied that proposition. You have endowed the church of England and the church of Scotland. They differ in doctrine; one of them, therefore, must be in error; and yet you have endowed them both. Sir R. Inglis was a strong advocate for church extension. He wanted to build a thousand churches; but would not tractors get into some of them, and if so, would not the public money get into the hands of those who, in his opinion, were teachers of error? The principle on which parliament acted was, that where the truth was of such value as to require to be made known, it would not shrink from circulating it, even though there should be an alloy of error mixed with it. It was on this ground that it had decided that it was better that the people of Ireland should be Roman catholics, than professors of no religion at all. The quantity of good in the Roman catholic religion was so infinitely beyond any mischief deducible from its disputable doctrines, that it was far better that the Irish peasant should be instructed in it, than that he should live without religious restraint, or die without religious consolation. As to the arguments against the measure urged by the friends of the voluntary principle, if he were one of them, he should say that this case of Maynooth was an exception.

Here we see an island with a population of several millions, and an established church for a few hundred thousand persons, with large endowments. If I recollect rightly the debates of 1833, these amount to some hundred thousand pounds, twelve prelates dividing the sum of £70,000. The protestant dissenters of the north of Ireland at the same time receive assistance from the state. The present endowment is solicited on behalf of four-fifths of the population of the country, the poorest of all, who stand in need of aid from the public funds if any party is to have it, and they belong to the very communion for whom the present ecclesiastical endowments were originally intended by the donors.

Justice required that some endowment should be made for them. Where it was to come from was another question; all that the House had to settle that night was, that some should be given. He then adverted to the argument of Mr D'Israeli, that this measure ought to be rejected because it was brought forward by men who were not morally entitled to bring it forward.

It is impossible for me not to say that it has been too much the habit of the right hon. baronet to make use of, when in opposition (as he had done in reference to the present question), passions with which he had not the slightest sympathy, and prejudices which he regarded with profound contempt [renewed cheers]. As soon as he reaches power, a change—a salutary change for the country—takes place. The instruments are flung aside—the ladder by which he climbed is kicked down [cheers]. This is not a solitary instance, and I am forced to say that this sort of conduct is pursued by the right hon. baronet on something like a system. I shall not attempt to go over the events of years ago. I shall say nothing more of 1827 and 1829 than this—that one such change was quite enough for one man [hear, hear]. Again the right hon. baronet is in opposition, and again he and those with whom he acts return to their old tactics. I will not go through the history of all those manoeuvres by which the whig government was overthrown; I will only ask this question, whether there be one single class of men which rallied round the right hon. baronet at that time, which does not now declare bitterly against him [hear, hear]? One part of this subject I will leave to the management of the landed gentlemen, and I shall confide myself to the matter before us. I defy any man to deny that the cry which most injured the Melbourne government was the "no popery" cry. This was admitted by the hon. member for Northamptonshire (Mr S. O'Brien). Is there a single person in this House who believes, that if four years ago my noble friend (Lord John Russell) had brought in this bill, it would not have been opposed by the whole party then in opposition? Indeed, four years ago we were discussing a very different bill. At that time the party in opposition brought in a bill which, though under another name, was neither more or less than a bill to disfranchise the people of Ireland by tens of thousands. They brought it in and pressed it on, representing it to be necessary for the good government of Ireland; and all their followers declared that it was necessary it should pass in order to purge the House of Commons of the minions of popery. It was argued, on the other hand, that that bill would destroy the Irish constituency, and the right hon. gentlemen opposite have since shown by their conduct that they knew it would have that effect [hear, hear]. We pleaded for delay—we asked the party in opposition to wait till we instituted inquiries as to the effect of the measure—we called on them to wait at least till the next session. No notice was taken of our appeals—the Irish Registration bill was stated to be of the utmost urgency, and it was pressed on the House. At length a change took place—a change from opposition to power. The right hon. baronet's instruments were needed no more [hear, hear]. The right hon. baronet had been in power for four years, and has had a Parliament which would have passed the Irish Registration bill. Where is the Irish Registration bill? [cheers.] Flung away—positively pronounced, by its authors, to be so oppressive and destructive of the representative system, that no minister of the crown could venture to

propose it [cheers]. That bill having been thrown away, what has been substituted for it? Why, the present bill for the endowment of Maynooth college [cheers]. Did ever person witness such legerdemain? [renewed cheers.] You offer to the eager, honest, hot-headed protestant, a bill to take privileges away from the Roman catholics of Ireland, if he will only assist you to power. He lends you his aid; and then, when you are in power, you turn round on him and give him a bill for the religious endowment of the Roman catholic college in Ireland [hear, hear]. Is it strange that such proceedings as these should excite indignation? [cheers.] Can we wonder at the clamour which has been raised in the country, or be surprised at the petitions which have been showered, thick as a snow storm, on the table of the House? Is it possible that the people out of doors should not feel indignation at seeing that the very parties who, when we were in office, voted against the Maynooth grant, are now being whipped into the House in order to vote for an increased Maynooth grant [cheers]? The natural consequences follow. Can you wonder that all those fierce spirits whom you have taught to harass us, now turn round and begin to worry you? The Orangeman raises his howl, and Exeter hall sets up its Bray [laughter], and Mr M'Neill is horror-stricken to think that a still larger grant is intended for "the priests of Baal" at the table of "Jezebel" [cheers], and your protestant operatives of Dublin call for the impeachment of the minister in exceedingly bad English [cheers and laughter]. But what did you expect? Did you think, when you called up for your own purposes the devil of religious animosities, that you could lay him as easily as you raised him [hear, hear]? Did you think when, session after session, you went on attacking those whom you knew to be in the right, and flattering the prejudices of those whom you knew to be in the wrong, that the day of reckoning would never come? That day has come [cheers]; and now, on that day, you are doing penance for the disingenuousness of years [hear, hear]. If it be not so, clear your fame, as public men, manfully before this house and this country. Show us some clear principle, with respect to Irish affairs, which has guided you both in office and in opposition [loud cheers]. Show us how, if you are honest in 1845, you could have been honest in 1841 [cheers]. Explain to us why, after having, when out of place, goaded Ireland into madness in order to ingratiate yourselves with England, you are now throwing England into a flame in order to ingratiate yourselves with Ireland. Let us hear some argument that, as ministers, you are entitled to support, which shall not equally show that you are the most factious and unprincipled opposition this country ever saw [loud cheers].

But, though he believed that whilst out of power they were the most factious opposition which England had ever seen, he would not on that account reject the bill, which they had introduced for the benefit of Ireland, now that they were in power; and would support it, regardless of the obloquy to which his vote might expose him, and at the risk of losing his seat in parliament, which he, however, could never lose in a more honourable cause.

Mr SHAW said he had been in Ireland when the first copy of this bill arrived there; and he never recollects any impression so deep as that which it occasioned. He then entered into an explanation of the reasons which induced him to oppose it; and, in reply to Mr Gladstone's observation, that protestantism was but a negative creed, observed, with great warmth, and amid loud cheers from the House, that the name of protestantism was still intelligible and dear to the hearts of the people of England. Whenever they should forget what was due to protestantism, the days of this country would be numbered, and its great glory as a great nation in the world would be departed. He recommended ministers not to irritate the protestants, who had hitherto been the firm friends of the Union, at this moment, when the masses in Ireland were using every effort to become a separate and independent people. Let them beware lest they should find the whole Irish nation united, for the first time in its history, in one general discontent. He should give his "most cordial" opposition to this bill in every stage of it.

Mr S. HERBERT supported the policy of ministers in bringing forward this measure; and then proceeded to defend them from the accusation preferred by Mr Macaulay, that they had deserted their former principles.

On the motion of Captain BERESFORD, the debate was again adjourned.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AUDACITY OF RAILWAY SPECULATORS.—The Speaker of the House of Commons called attention, on Wednesday, to the fifteenth clause of the Midland Railway's Extension bill, which proposes to give compulsory powers to the company to take any land they please, *within five miles of the railway*, for the conveyance of coal and minerals!

"Therefore, by it," said the Speaker, "these parties, without any specifications or sections having been deposited to show what they wished to take, were to have compulsory powers to pass through the land [hear, hear]. He need hardly say, that such a claim was directly contrary to the standing orders of the House [hear, hear]. Perhaps the better course would be, to discharge the order for the second reading, as it had already been read a first time, and been ordered to be read a second time, and refer the bill back to the select committee; and if they found that the standing orders had not been complied with, they would state whether the bill should be proceeded with or not."

Mr DUNCOMBE denounced the clause as "atrocious;" and Mr STRUTT, exposing the cunning of its contrivers, informed the House that neither in the margin of the bill, nor in the index, was there anything to point out the nature of the powers proposed to be enforced. Lord GRANVILLE SOMERSET thought that some notice should be taken of the conduct of the agent for the bill. He trusted that the committee would do something to make him account for the extreme powers which he had attempted, in such a surreptitious manner, to obtain for the company. The order for the second reading was dis-

charged, and the bill referred to the select committee on private bills.

MUSEUMS OF ART.—On the motion for going into committee on Mr Ewart's bill for establishing museums in large towns, Mr BUCK moved that it be considered that day six months. Sir J. GRAHAM hoped that Mr Buck would not persevere with his amendment, as that would be equivalent to the entire rejection of the bill. He proposed that the consideration of the bill should be postponed for another week, and in the meantime he would have an opportunity for ascertaining the feeling of the government respecting it. This was agreed to, and the consideration of the bill was postponed.

A SCENE IN THE HOUSE.—After the presentation of a vast heap of petitions, on Friday night, Mr FERRAND produced one from the Dublin Protestant Operative Association. By a sleight of tongue, he attempted to evade the rule of the House against doing more than reading the substance of a petition. With trifling alterations of words, he was reading the petition itself—a long, disputatious, and extravagantly-worded document—when he was called to order by Mr ROEBUCK; and the objection was sustained by the SPEAKER. Again Mr FERRAND began to read; again he was called to order; and so on again and again, amid a hubbub of laughter and provocative cheers. At length, Mr ROEBUCK moved that the honourable member be commanded at once to bring up his petition; on which Mr FERRAND threatened to have the huge roll read *in extenso* by the clerk at the table; but his friends dissuaded him from fulfilling his threat, and he contented himself with reading the "prayer." The Dublin Protestant Operative Association prayed that the House would cause Sir Robert Peel to be impeached; and, if he were not convicted, that still the House would call upon the Sovereign "to remove Sir Robert Peel from her councils, as one who has disgusted all parties—who ousted other men from their places, merely to adopt their policy—and who, if he have succeeded in replenishing the coffers of the exchequer, has done so while carrying out measures calculated to draw down the wrath of Heaven on the land." The whole of the protracted scene had caused much merriment; but at this prayer the House was convulsed with laughter.

A NEW WATT was, on Monday night, ordered to issue for the county of Kent, in the room of Viscount Marsham, now Earl of Romney.

GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.—On the same evening, Mr FERRAND gave notice that, if the bill for the endowment of Maynooth arrived at such an advanced stage as a third reading, he would move, as an amendment, the following resolution:

"That it is the opinion of this House that the 7th and 8th of Victoria, cap. 97, commonly called the Charitable Bequests act, and which received the royal assent on the 9th of August, 1844, is a violation of the act of Settlement, and in contravention of the oath of Supremacy, and that the Maynooth College bill is calculated to spread a religion which is opposed to the protestant religion as established by law."

Mr SHARMAN CRAWFORD's proposed motion appears elsewhere.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, April 11th.

THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.—A great number of petitions were presented against the grant to Maynooth, and gave rise to some discussion. It was objected by the Marquis of NORMANBY that, as the bill had not yet come before the House, petitions against the measure could not yet, consistently with the orders of the House, be received. The Duke of WELLINGTON, however, said that petitions against a principle, or generally against any measure of a certain description, might be presented—and the Earl of SHAPESBURY, that petitions against any further grant to Maynooth, or any increased grant (not against the particular proposal in the other House), might properly be presented. Under this saving clause the petitions were received. Lord KENYON presented petitions from fifty-five different places, signed by upwards of 4,000 persons, against any further grant to Maynooth. He entirely agreed in the prayer of the petition, though he thought that, consistently with good faith and honour, they were bound not to withdraw the grant made previously to the union between Great Britain and Ireland. Lord DENMAN presented a petition from Bradford, not only praying that no further grant might be made to Maynooth, but also that the legislature would *retrace their steps, and provide for the entire separation of church and state.*

The third reading of the Sugar Duties bill gave rise to a long debate. The measure was supported by the Earl of DALHOUSIE, Lord BROUGHAM, and Lord STANLEY—assailed by the Earl of CLARENCE and Lord MONTEAGLE; but without the slightest novelty of argument. Eventually it was passed.

Monday, April 14th.

THE GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.—Numerous petitions from all parts of the kingdom were presented against the proposed endowment of Maynooth college. The Marquis of ANGLESEA, Lord HATHERTON, Lord BROUGHAM, Lord CAMPBELL, the Bishop of ST DAVID'S, the Marquis of CAMDEN, the Earl of ELLENBOROUGH, and the Earl of ST GERMAN, in presenting petitions, expressed their approval of the government measure. The Marquis of BREADALBANE, in presenting a great many petitions against any grant to Maynooth from Cupar and other places in Scotland, said that he had constantly voted for catholic emancipation, and for an equality of civil rights among all classes of his countrymen; but, with the petitioners, he drew a distinction between civil rights, and in substance making a new church endowment and establishment. He thought that the

course taken by her Majesty's government in this matter was most imprudent and censurable.

THE RAILWAY BOARD.—The Earl of DALHOUSIE, in reply to the Marquis of CLANRICARDE, stated that the railway committee of the Board of Trade, in reporting in favour of railways in Ireland, did so, not absolutely as the best lines that could be devised, but as the best which had been submitted to their consideration. Ireland was so far different from England, that it had been elaborately surveyed by a commission appointed by the government seven years ago; and an admirable report had been the result. By its conclusions the railway committee had been guided; and whenever it was necessary to depart from them, it was always with regret, and always under circumstances which would probably, under the altered circumstances, have been sanctioned by the commissioners themselves.

Lord DALHOUSIE moved the second reading of the Land Clauses Consolidation bill, which was opposed by Lord BEAUMONT, who moved that the bill be referred to a select committee. The amendment was, however, negatived; and the bill, having, with one or two alterations, gone through committee, was reported, and their lordships adjourned.

Literature.

THE PERIODICALS (APRIL).

THE last number of the "Westminster Review" is full of matter of great variety and general excellence. "The French Economists" is a good paper, containing a clear and clever view of the progress of political economy. The next, on Shakspere, presents some keen criticism by one who is not too much in love with the "immortal bard" to be able to exercise his wits. "Recent Negotiations with Germany" is a valuable article. "Chronology of the Egyptians" is thickly-studded with dates and names, and furnishes some interesting disquisition. "Lunatic Asylums" abounds in humane and sensible remarks and suggestions. No. III. of "City Administration" follows up the attack with abundance of figures. Altogether, it is a massive number, giving plenty to think upon, but rather wanting in vivacity and sprightliness.

The editor of the "Eclectic Review" contemplates the reduction of the price of that periodical to eighteen-pence, if he can obtain a sufficient increase of subscribers to prevent loss. It is a bold experiment. We need not say, that we heartily wish it success. It is a work that supplies the soundest principles in a form eminently calculated to enlist both judgment and heart in their favour. The first paper is on Thomas Carlyle, written by one who is evidently capable of appreciating him, and anxious to do him justice, though by no means under the influence of the Carlyle-mania which has seized so many writers and readers. Without committing ourselves to all the opinions advanced respecting that great man, the article contains much that we must earnestly commend to the attention of our readers. If we excepted, it would be to more of the praise than the censure. The following closing observations we cordially approve:

"Mr Carlyle's treatment of questions bearing on religion is anything but uniformly offensive: here, as we think, lies much of the mischief. However firm, conscientious, and practically consistent Mr Carlyle's own religious views may be—and we are far from assuming a disposition to condemn him, in this respect—one thing is as clear to our apprehension as most things of the kind, namely, that the religious tendency of his writings is not in the same direction with what *we believe to be* the drift of prophets, evangelists, and apostles. This is too sacred a theme for either flattery or reproach. But if the worst influences of German infidelity—the *cast-off* infidelity of England—do not taint the minds of Mr Carlyle's readers, our experience has been singularly unfortunate, and our observation, which has been neither idle nor unfriendly, has deceived us in a way for which we are at a loss to account."

The other articles are—"Travels in Southern Abyssinia;" "Continental Seminaries;" "Letha, and other Poems;" "History of the War of the Independence of the United States of America;" an able exposure of the "Game Laws;" and "Maynooth College;" which gives a valuable history of the grant to that establishment, and puts the opposition to it on the true ground—the only ground on which it can be consistently or justly assailed—the impropriety of all state support of religious opinions.

"Tait" makes a strong and sturdy attempt to make his readers acquainted with the "Poems and Politics of Freiligrath;" continues the "Tale of the Celts and Saxons," the "Life and Correspondence of Niebuhr," "A Rosary from the Ithine," and "Nights in the Martello;" and "Letters from Naples"—reviews "The Improvisatore" and "Hawkestone"—gives shorter or longer notices of a multitude of other books—and winds up with some good sense on "The Politics of the Month;" the points commented on being "the budget," and Mr Cobden's motion for "inquiry into the causes of agricultural distress."

"Douglas Jerrold's Shilling Magazine" preserves its character as a generally sound advocate of morality and humanity, without cant and conventionalism. The continuation of "St Giles and St James;" "Sonnet on the Death of Laman Blanchard;" "Truth in a Vision;" "The Parson's Gamekeeper;" "A Case at Sessions;" "Cat-and-

Fiddle Moralities ; "Holidays for the People," "April Fools," have all more or less of point and wholesome tendency. We give an extract from the "Hedgehog Letters," by the Editor. It is on "Clerical Advertisements":—

"At Bishop's Lydeard, a curate is tempted with 'a neat little cottage, and 'almost certainly the chaplaincy of an adjoining union,' with 'other considerations' (what can *they* be, grandmother?), which will make the salary equivalent to £100 per annum. And for this he must be orthodox and married.

"Another curate is wanted in a 'small parish in Berks,' where 'the duty is light.' What would the apostles have said to such an offer?

"A beneficed clergyman, advertising from Camberwell, wishes for duty 'in some agricultural and picturesque part of the north of England.' A picturesque part! You see, it isn't every one who would like to preach in the wilderness.

"Another curate is required in Nottinghamshire: salary, £100 per annum. He must have the highest references for 'gentlemanly manners,' as 'the vicar is resident.' I suppose, if the vicar was away, a second or third-rate style would do well enough for the parishioners.

"However, you'll be glad to learn that several of the advertisers profess to be 'void of tractarianism and other novelties.' Just in the same way as they write up somewhere in Piccadilly—'The original brown bear.'

"Another clergyman 'is desirous of meeting with an early appointment in town'; and, grandmother, you may judge of the length this gentleman will go to preach Christianity and save human souls, when he adds—'no objection to the Surrey side!' Isn't this good of him? Because, you know, grandmother, the *opera*, and the club-houses, and the divans, and so forth, are none of them on the Surrey side. To be sure, there's the Victoria, and Astley's—but they're low.

"Now, grandmother, don't all these advertisements smell a little too much of trade—don't they, for your notions of the right thing, jingle a little too much with gold and silver? As I'm an honest cabman, though I knew I was reading all about the church and her pious sons, yet, somehow, the advertisements did put me in mind of 'Rowland's Macassar,' 'Mechi's magic straps,' and 'good stout cobs to be disposed of.'

The "Continental Echo" is designed to acquaint our countrymen with the state of religion on the continent of Europe. The present is the fourth number. It is well conducted, is calculated to do great good in the present state of opinions and parties, and we cordially wish it success.

The "Christian Treasury" is likewise a new periodical, the first part of which was published last month. It contains contributions from ministers and members of various evangelical denominations, and is published in Scotland. The first part is enriched with articles by Drs Brown, King, and Buchanan, and Revs Thomson, Tweedie, Guthrie, Watson, &c. It is excellently adapted for family and personal instruction in the truths and precepts of Christianity, and withal very cheap.

The "Modern Orator" continues to fulfil the promise with which it was begun. The present part contains speeches by Richard Brinsley Sheridan—among others, his celebrated speech on the impeachment of Warren Hastings, which obtained the most unqualified eulogium of Edmund Burke.

Illustrations of the Practical Power of Faith, in a series of Popular Discourses on part of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By T. BINNEY. Second Edition. Snow, Paternoster row.

THIS volume, contains fourteen discourses, which were delivered at Newport, in the Isle of Wight. They form part of a continuous exposition of the epistle to the Hebrews, which was delivered by Mr Binney to his then charge. These "Discourses" comprise one on the Nature of Faith; one on the Faith of Abel; two on the Character and Faith of Enoch; two on the Faith of Noah, and on the Principles and Lessons illustrated by his History; four on the Trials and general Character of Abraham; one on the Sentiments suitable to Pilgrims and Strangers; two on Justification; and, prefixed to the whole, is a beautiful Epistle Dedicatory, addressed to the church of which Mr Binney was then pastor.

This volume is worthy of the established reputation of the esteemed minister of the Weigh House chapel. It is argumentative, original, profound; admirably lucid in statement, and felicitous in illustration. It is not necessary that we should here indicate those "Discourses" which have afforded us the greatest amount of pleasure. We cannot forbear, however, to direct the attention of our readers to the discourse on the Nature of Faith, and those on Justification. These are somewhat distinct from the other discourses. The former of these is a masterly disquisition on the faith which is the "confident expectation" of "things hoped for," and the "perfect persuasion" of "things not seen," and which the author describes as the "repose of the intellect and the repose of the affections;" while the latter exhibits and illustrates an important scripture doctrine, without being disfigured and obscured by the technicalities too commonly found in theological systems. The other discourses are of a more practical character, and afford greater scope for beauty of illustration, and for general application to the difficulties and duties of the Christian life.

We regret that our space will not permit us to enrich this notice by quotations. We had marked numerous passages, which we are sure would have afforded our readers profit and pleasure. Especially are the discourses on the Character and Translation of Enoch, on the Lessons derived from the history of Noah, on the Sentiments suitable to Pilgrims and Strangers, and on the Character of Abraham, full of instruction and beautiful writing.

The title page informs us that this is the second edition of this work. The preface to the first was written in 1830, and the advertisement to this in 1844, so that fourteen years had nearly elapsed before a second edition was issued. We are sorry for this, it does not speak well for the public taste. We recommend this work to our readers; and hope that none of them who can afford it will neglect to avail themselves of the pleasure which the perusal of this volume cannot fail to impart.

Luther and Calvin; or the True Spirit of the Reformed Church. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D.D. Blackie and Son, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and London. 1844.

A CLEAR, instructive, and forcible tract, worthy of the name of its well-known author, and intended to show the points which reform (meaning, by that phrase, the work of Zwingle and Calvin) has in common with Lutheranism, and the points in which Lutheranism, as compared with reform, has failed of carrying out its own professed objects. Some references at the close, on the alliance of church and state, are not so distinct as we could have desired in a tract like the present. But it is of general circulation.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

1. *Lectures to the Working Classes*. By W. J. FOX.
2. *Minutes of Proceedings of Delegates from Independent Colleges*.
3. *Illustrations of Unitarian Christianity*. By WILLIAM HINCKS, F.L.S.
4. *Lectures on the Divinity of the Son of God*. By ROBERT GRACE.
5. *The Railway Shareholder's Manual*. By HENRY TUCK.
6. *The Oxford Argo*. By an OXFORD DIVINE.

Religious Intelligence.

MUNIFICENT COLLECTION.—On Sabbath week, a collection was made in free St Paul's church, Glasgow, in order to aid in liquidating the debt upon the building, and the expense of painting the pulpit, galleries, &c. Dr Forbes, the pastor, officiated, and the amount contributed exceeded £250, and leaves the debt upon the church under £100.

BERWICK-ON-TWEED.—On Thursday evening, the 20th of March, a church was formed on congregational principles. On the occasion Mr George Richards, Alnwick, preached an appropriate and impressive sermon, from Acts xi. 21: "The hand of the Lord was with them." The church was then regularly formed, and the ordinance of the Lord's supper administered to the newly-formed church, consisting of thirty-two members. This is the first independent church in this ancient town. The people have chosen Mr J. M. N. Boyd, who studied in connexion with the church of Scotland, for their pastor.

MR R. H. HERSCHELL.—On Monday evening, March 31, a meeting of converted Jews was held at the house of one of their number, for the purpose of presenting an expression of their gratitude to Mr R. H. Herschell (pastor of Chadwell Street chapel)—a splendidly bound copy of Bagster's folio Polyglot bible (in eight languages). This beautiful present was accompanied by an address.

WOBURN, BEDS.—Mr J. Andrews, late of Hackney college, has accepted a unanimous and pressing invitation to the pastorate of the independent church, Woburn, Beds; and entered upon his labours last Lord's day.

DEPARTURE OF DR BURNS.—About seven o'clock on Saturday night, Dr Burns, late of Paisley, and now professor of theology in the Free church college, Toronto, sailed in the good ship Errromanga, Captain Kelso, from Greenock, for Montreal.—*Greenock Advertiser*.

COLEFORD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.—On Wednesday, April the 4th, Mr John Penny was ordained as pastor of the baptist church in this town, when the following services were held. In the morning, Mr T. Winter, of Bristol, delivered the introductory discourse; Mr E. A. Claypole, of Ross, proposed the questions; Mr R. W. Overbury, of London, gave the charge. In the evening, Mr S. Nicholson, of Plymouth, addressed the church and congregation; the devotional exercises were conducted by Messrs Elliott of Lydney, Williams of Ryeford, Thomas of Coleford (independent), Slembridge of Monmouth, Philpin of Whitebrook, and Coombs of Newnham. The company was numerous, and the services were highly interesting.

MISSIONARY ORDINATION.—On Thursday, March 20th, Mr John Sugden, B.A., of London university, and late of Highbury college, was solemnly set apart at Bishopsgate chapel, London, to the work of missionary to Bangalore, in connexion with the London Missionary Society. Mr E. Manning commenced the services with reading the scriptures and prayer; Mr A. Tidman, foreign secretary, gave a very instructive account of the past history and present condition of the mission, particularly in reference to the Theological seminary now under the superintendence of Mr E. Crisp, with whom Mr S. expects to be associated; Mr J. Arundel asked the usual questions; Dr Henderson offered, with much affection and appropriateness, the ordination prayer; Dr R. W. Hamilton gave an excellent and impressive charge to the young missionary, founded on Rom. xv. 23.—"But now having no more place in these parts;" and Mr Henry Townley, minister of the chapel, then concluded the deeply interesting service by prayer. The audience throughout, including a large number of ministers and students, several of whom rendered assistance on the occasion, was very numerous, attentive, and devout.

BIRTHS.

April 7, the wife of Mr A. R. PHILPS, independent minister, Blakeney, Gloucestershire, of a daughter.

April 11, at North Nibley, near Wotton-under-Edge, Gloucestershire, the lady of Major T. BIDDLE, H.E.I.C.S., of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

April 3, at Newton-le-Willows, by the pastor, Mr R. Mayne, Mr EDWARD ATKINS, to Miss CHARLOTTE McGOWAN, both of Warrington.

April 3, at Albion chapel, Hull, by Mr N. Hall, B.A., Mr JOSEPH CARNLEY, of West Melton, near Rotherham, to JANE, third daughter of Mr S. K. BIRCH, of the above place.

April 3, at the tabernacle, Bristol, by Mr J. Davies, C. J. METCALFE, Esq., of Chawton house, eldest son of C. J. Metcalfe, Esq., of Roxton park, Beds, to LOUISA, third daughter of J. DANDO, Esq., Ashley hill, Bristol.

April 6, at the independent chapel, Wheathampstead, Herts,

by Mr Thomas Gilbert, Mr PHILIP WEEDON, paper maker, of Wheathampstead, to ELIZABETH, daughter of Mr GREY, of Pickford mills.

April 7, at the independent chapel, Oakhampton, Devon, by Mr W. BURD, Mr RICHARD POTTER, to Miss MARTHA HERSON, April 8, at St John's chapel, Bedford row, London, Mr J. WEBB, of Ipswich, to FRANCES, second surviving daughter of the late Mr W. WARD, M.A., Diss.

April 9, at the Croft chapel, Hastings, by Mr E. Prout, of Halstead, Mr CHARLES HICKMAN, independent minister of Leytonstone, to Miss SARAH STALLYBRASS, of Bishop's Stortford.

April 10, at the independent chapel, Newark, by Mr H. L. Adams, Mr DAVID TENNANT, to Miss MARY MARCHANT, both of this town. Also Mr JOHN HOLMES to Mrs CHARLOTTE BLIGHTON, April 11, at the independent chapel, Chalvey, Bucks, by Mr L. HALL, Poyle, WILLIAM, third son of the above, to SUSAN, eldest daughter of Mr W. BARNES, Eton.

April 14, at Church Lane chapel, Banbury, by Mr John Lewis, Mr GEORGE MACKLIN, to Miss SARAH JOHNSON GIBSON.

DEATHS.

April 7, Crescent, Peterborough, at the house of her son, Mr A. GOOD, AGNES, the beloved wife of Peter GOOD, gentleman, aged 77.

April 8, at the Triangle, Hackney, in the 87th year of her age, Mrs SARAH HOBY, widow of the late Mr George Hoby, of St James's street, Piccadilly.

April 9, ALICE MARY, the infant daughter of Mr George KNOX, 7, Cludesley street, Islington.

April 13, at Bow, Middlesex, aged 67, ELIZABETH NEWMAN, widow of the late Dr Newman.

Trade and Commerce.

LONDON GAZETTE.

Friday, April 12.

The following building is certified as a place duly registered for solemnising marriages, pursuant to the act of 6 and 7 Wm IV., cap. 85:—

Zion chapel, Corwen, Merionethshire.

BANKRUPTIES ANNULLED.

FLINT, ALGERNON LINDSEY, Aldermanbury, and Upper Clapton, warehouseman.

HARDWICK, WILLIAM, Holborn, draper.

BANKRUPTS.

ADLINGTON, THOMAS, Kingsland, corn merchant, April 18, May 31: solicitors, Messrs Carter and Gregory, Lord Mayor's Court office, Old Jewry.

BLACKMOOR, JOHN, Rotherham, Yorkshire, builder, April 24, May 15: solicitors, Mr Moss, Cloak lane, London; Mr Ryalls, Sheffield; and Mr Blackburn, Leeds.

COOGAN, HEZEKIAH DENBY, Friday street, City, warehouseman, April 25, May 21: solicitors, Messrs Soles and Turner, Aldermanbury.

EMANS, WILLIAM, Warwick square, Newgate street, City, and Church street, Kennington, Surrey, bookseller, April 23, May 27: solicitor, Mr Lonsdale, Temple chambers.

FORTY, THOMAS, Richmond, Surrey, hotel keeper, April 18, May 20: solicitor, Mr J. Weymouth, 89, Chancery lane.

HOME, JAMES, Woodstock mews, Blenheim street, New Bond street, veterinary surgeon, April 22, May 23: solicitor, Mr Wormald, Gray's Inn square.

LITTEN, RANDELL P., Newmarket place, Church road, Kingsland, April 25, May 27: solicitor, Mr Egan, 58, Lincoln's Inn fields.

PAYNE, GEORGE, King street, Covent garden, tailor, April 18, May 23: solicitors, Messrs Wood and Fraser, 78, Dean street, Soho.

POYNTER, WILLIAM, St Paul's churchyard, warehouseman, April 24, May 23: solicitor, Mr C. M. King, St Mary Axe.

PRITCHARD, JOHN, Lilleshall, Shropshire, builder, April 21, May 16: solicitors, Messrs Mottram and Knewle, Birmingham.

SIMPSON, ALEXANDER HORATIO, and IRVIN, PETER HUNTER, Blackfriars road, engineers, April 15, May 24: solicitor, Mr Kell, Bedford row.

WINSCOMBE, JAMES, Clifton, Bristol, bootmaker, April 23, May 16: solicitors, Messrs Peters and Abbott, Bristol.

SCOTCH SEQUESTRATIONS.

PEARSTON, J. and J., Glasgow, grocers, April 18, May 9.

TODD, ANDREW, and SON, Alva, manufacturers, April 17, May 8.

WISE, JAMES, late of Falkirk, builder, April 16, May 7.

DIVIDENDS.

J. and D. ARTHUR, Neath, coal merchants; first div. of 1*l*d. every Monday—J. WATSON, 35, Crawford street, linen draper; second div. of 8*d*, any Wednesday.

Tuesday, April 15.

The following buildings are certified as places duly registered for solemnising marriages, pursuant to an act of 6 and 7 Wm IV., cap. 85:—

Primitive methodist chapel, Luton, Bedfordshire.

Sardis chapel, Newbridge, Glamorganshire.

Tabernacle chapel, Rhayader, Radnorshire.

Independent chapel, Newmarket.

Ebenezer chapel, Cromford, Derbyshire.

BANKRUPTS.

AYTON, JOSEPH JOBLING, South Shields, linen draper, April 29, June 3: solicitors, Mr James Wilson, South Shields; and Mr Robert Hodgson, 32, Broad Street buildings, London.

BARKER, PRESTON, Shelton, Staffordshire, publican, April 26, May 27: solicitors, Mr Challinor, Hanley; and Messrs Mottram and Knowles, Birmingham.

BENNET, WILLIAM WISHLIRE, Liverpool, merchant, April 25, May 20: solicitors, Messrs Gregory and Co., Bedford row, London; and Mr Robert Frodsham, Liverpool.

BRADSHAW, JOB, St Albans, Hertfordshire, draper, April 25, May 27: solicitor, Mr Walker, Furnival's inn.

DODD, THOMAS STEWART, Liverpool, innkeeper, April 28, May 26: solicitors, Messrs Bridger and Blake, London wall, London; and Mr Dodge, Liverpool.

HAMPSON, KENRICK FREDERICK ALEXANDER, 16, Walmtree walk, Lambeth, gas fitter, April 25, May 20: solicitor, Mr William Smith, Wilmington square.

HODKINSON, WILLIAM, 1, Weston street, Pentonville, slater, April 23, May 27: solicitor, Mr Nash, Goswell road.

JARVIS, JOSEPH and JAMES, Great Bush lane, Cannon street, City, wine merchants, April 24, June 6: solicitor, Mr Gale, Basinghall street.

JONES, JOHN, Pinchbeck, Lincolnshire, butcher, April 26, May 27: solicitors, Messrs Bonner and Sons, Spalding, and Messrs Mottram and Knowles, Birmingham.

JONES, WILLIAM, late of the Adelaide gallery, Strand, commission agent, April 25, May 27: solicitor, Mr Crouch, Southampton buildings, Chancery lane.

LEADER, JOHN MORGAN, 361, Oxford street, coach maker April 25, May 29: solicitors, Messrs Bailey and Shaw, Berners street, Oxford street.

WILSON, REV. DAVID, minister of Stranraer, Wigtonshire, April 22, May 13.
STEEL, ADAM, Stirling, merchant, April 22, May 13.

DIVIDENDS DECLARED.

J. T. Maund, Birmingham, laceman, first div. of 2s. 6d., any Saturday—T. Tempest, Leeds, grocer, first and final div. of 5s., any Tuesday—F. Parker, Rotherham, Yorkshire, seed crusher, final div. of 6d., and upon new proofs, div. of 8s. 5d., any Tuesday—O. P. Wathen, Gloucestershire, clothier, first and final div. of 9d., any Wednesday—T. Kearsley and T. Watt, Runcorn, Cheshire, bone merchants, div. of 2s. 5d., on the separate estate of T. Watt; of 6s. 8d. on the separate estate of T. Kearsley; and of 8d. on the joint estate, April 29, and any subsequent Tuesday—J. S. Carter and R. Cornforth, Liverpool, merchants, third div. of 8d., any Monday—J. F. Corr and J. L. De Corle, 142, New Bond street, coach builders, first div. of 6s., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—Thomas George Postans, 142, Aldersgate street, City, appraiser, final div. of 3s. 2d., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—J. R. Stringer, Houndsditch, City, clothier, final div. of 6d., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—B. Perkins and S. Woolley, Stamford, Lincolnshire, drapers, first div. of 6s. 2d., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—S. Billingsley, jun., Harwich, Essex, merchant, first div. of 4s. 3d., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—J. Nutter, Cambridge, miller, sec. div. of 1d., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—G. F. Smith, Gutter lane, crêpe manufacturer, first div. of 2s. 6d., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—L. D. Smith, Gutter lane, crêpe manufacturer, first div. of 3s., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—S. T. Watson and W. Byers, Skinner street, City, woolen warehousemen, first div. of 2s., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—W. G. Kelso, Canterbury, builder, first div. of 6d., April 16, and two following Wednesdays—J. E. Vardy, Portsmouth, linen draper, first div. of 2s., April 16, and two following Wednesdays.

BRITISH FUNDS.

The prices of the English funds have fluctuated considerably since our last, owing to the position of the ministry on the Maynooth question. Since Monday they have been firmer, and more business is doing.

	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.
3 per cent. Consols	99 1/2	99 1/2	99 1/2	99	99	99 1/2
Ditto for Account	99 1/2	99 1/2	99 1/2	99	99	99 1/2
3 per cent Reduced	—	98	98	98	98	98
New 3d. percent...	—	100 1/2	101	101	101	101
Long Annuities...	—	111	111	111	111	111
Bank Stock...	—	211	210 1/2	210 1/2	211	211
India Stock...	—	279	278	278	279	278
Exchequer Bills...	60pm	59pm	59pm	58pm	59pm	59pm
India Bonds	—	71pm	73pm	72pm	73pm	73pm

FOREIGN FUNDS.

Austrian	—	Mexican	36
Belgian	101 1/2	Peruvian	32
Brazilian	88	Portuguese 5 per cents	87 1/2
Buenos Ayres	41	Ditto converted	65
Columbian	16	Russian	116
Danish	89	Spanish Active	30
Dutch 2d. per cents	63	Ditto Passive	7
Ditto 4 per cents	97	Ditto Deferred	18

RAILWAY SHARES.

Birmingham and Derby	—	London & Birm. 1/2 Shares	23
Birmingham & Gloucester	137	London and Brighton	64
Blackwall	84	London & Croydon Trunk	18
Bristol and Exeter	86	London and Greenwich	11
Cheltenham & Gt. Western	—	Ditto New	25
Eastern Counties	204	Manchester and Leeds	148
Edinburgh and Glasgow	63	Midland Counties	154
Grand Junction	—	Ditto New Shares	20
Great North of England	197	Midland and Derby	115
Great Western	186	Ditto New	—
Ditto Half	103	South Eastern and Dover	42
Ditto Fifths	42	South Western	82
London and Birmingham	235	Ditto New	15

MARKETS.

MARK LANE, MONDAY, April 14.

There was a fair show of wheat this morning, and a good supply of barley; but of oats, beans, and peas, the quantities were small. The demand for wheat was very dull, and only the finest qualities realised former terms, all other descriptions being 1s. per quarter lower than on this day se'might.

Barley was extremely difficult of disposal, and must be quoted 1s. per quarter lower, a large portion remaining on hand at the close of business.

Beans and peas were in fair request, and quite as dear as on Monday.

Oats, likewise, sold on fully as good terms.

	s.	s.		s.	s.	
Wheat, Red New	40	40	46	Malt, Ordinary	46	52
Fine	46	51	Pale	56	64	
White	42	50	Rye	30	34	
Fine	50	54	Peas, Hog	32	36	
Flour, per sack	32	36	Maple	33	38	
Barley	23	26	Boilers	32	36	
Malting	32	35	Beans, Ticks	31	36	

	s.	s.	DUTY ON FOREIGN CORN.	
Beans, Pigeon	34	40	Wheat	20s. 0d.
Barley	33	36	Barley	6 0
Oats, Feed	20	22	Oats	6 0
Fine	22	24	Rye	10 6
Poland	21	24	Beans	8 6
Potato	22	24	Peas	7 6

	APRIL 11.	SIX WEEKS.	AGGREGATE AVERAGE OF THE	
Wheat	46s. 5d.	45s. 9d.	Wheat	45s. 9d.
Barley	32 5	32 3	Barley	32 3
Oats	21 4	21 6	Oats	21 6
Rye	29 6	30 8	Rye	30 8
Beans	35 0	34 9	Beans	34 9
Peas	35 7	35 5	Peas	35 5

SEEDS.

The business done in cloverseed was at reduced terms. Canaryseed was in fair request. Tares were saleable at about former rates.

	per qr.	Clover	per cwt.
English, sowing	52s. to 58s.	English, red...	45s. to 55
Baltic, ditto	—	Ditto, white...	60 .. 68
Ditto, crushing	38 .. 42	Flemish, pale...	40 .. 50
Medit. & Odessa	38 .. 40	Ditto, fine...	50 .. 54
Heupsseed, small	35 .. 38	New Hamb. red	40 .. 50
Large	—	Ditto, fine...	50 .. 54
Canary, new	47 .. 48	Old Hamb. red	—
Extra	50 ..	Ditto, fine...	—
Caraway, old	44 .. 46	French, red...	45 .. 60
New	48 .. 50	Ditto, white...	55 .. 73
Ryegrass, English	—	Coriander	12 .. 18
Scotch	—	Old	—
Mustard	per bushel	Rapeseed, 24d. to 26d. per last.	
Brown, new	8 .. 12	English, new .. 23d. to 25d.	
White	12 .. 14	Foreign	7d. to 9d.
Trefoil	17 .. 24	Rapeseed cakes	— to —
Old	—		
Tares, new	6s. 6d. to 7s. 6d.		

PROVISIONS, LONDON, April 14.

There is no change in the demand for Irish butter; it continues to move off slowly at prices ranging from 80s. to 90s. according to quality, &c. Foreign sells freely at 90s. to 98s. for the best. The bacon market was dull, and for the general descriptions prices were the turn cheaper, but choice mild-cured parcels of sizeable still maintain their prices. There is an improved demand for lard, and higher rates looked for.

THE NONCONFORMIST.

HOPS, BOROUGH, Monday, April 14.

The market is steady, but we are almost tired of representing that business is not active. The holders, no doubt, must ultimately obtain the benefit of their firmness, for hops must be bought, sooner or later, and will not be in large supply.

POTATOES, BOROUGH, Monday, April 14.

This market continues to be abundantly supplied, but chiefly from the northern districts. Trade is very dull.

YORK REDS 50 to 80 | KENT & ESSEX WHITES 50 to 60

PERTH do 40 to 50 | WISBEACH KIDNEYS 60 to 70

EARLY DEVON do 55 to 60 | DO. WHITES 50 to 55

CORNWALL do 50 to 60 | GUERNSEY BLUES 50 to 60

JERSEY BLUES 50 to 60 | PRINCE REGENTS 60 to 65

YORK REDS 50 to 80 | KENT & ESSEX WHITES 50 to 60

PERTH do 40 to 50 | WISBEACH KIDNEYS 60 to 70

EARLY DEVON do 55 to 60 | DO. WHITES 50 to 55

CORNWALL do 50 to 60 | GUERNSEY BLUES 50 to 60

JERSEY BLUES 50 to 60 | PRINCE REGENTS 60 to 65

YORK REDS 50 to 80 | KENT & ESSEX WHITES 50 to 60

PERTH do 40 to 50 | WISBEACH KIDNEYS 60 to 70

EARLY DEVON do 55 to 60 | DO. WHITES 50 to 55

CORNWALL do 50 to 60 | GUERNSEY BLUES 50 to 60

JERSEY BLUES 50 to 60 | PRINCE REGENTS 60 to 65

YORK REDS 5

MAYNOOTH ENDOWMENT BILL.
ON THURSDAY (TO-MORROW) EVENING, APRIL 17, a PUBLIC MEETING of the DISSENTERS of BERMONDSEY and ROTHERHITHE will be held at JAMAICA-ROW CHAPEL, BERMONDSEY. Chair to be taken at Seven o'clock, by Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Bart.

* The Southwark and Lambeth Anti-Maynooth Committee for conducting, on Dissenting principles, an opposition to the Bill, will meet, for the present, every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday Mornings, at Seven o'clock, at Lion street School room, New Kent road.

ENDOWMENT OF POPERY.

AT an AGGREGATE MEETING of PROTESTANTS of all Denominations, held in Covent Garden Theatre, last Monday Evening, for the purpose of petitioning Parliament against the Establishment of Popery—R. C. L. BEVAN, Esq., in the chair—the following Resolutions were adopted:

Moved by Rev. Dr CROLY; seconded by Rev. J. BLACKBURN—

That, as it has pleased Almighty God to place our beloved country, since its reformation from popery, first amongst the kingdoms of Europe for wealth, power, and liberty, so it would be, in the judgment of this meeting, a fearful dereliction of duty, and an act of base ingratitude to the Supreme Ruler of nations, to abandon those protestant principles which have been the foundation of our country's prosperity.

Moved by Rev. J. SHERMAN; seconded by Rev. W. CHALMERS—

That the proposal of her Majesty's government, formally to endow the college of Maynooth, for the education of the Romish priesthood of Ireland, at the expense of the United Kingdom, is a measure which this meeting feels constrained, by every principle of religion, to oppose by all the means of resistance which the laws and constitution of these realms will permit; and that the following petition to the House of Commons be therefore adopted.

Moved by Rev. Dr DIXON; seconded by SAMUEL BLACKBURN, Esq.—

That, as citizens of a free country, and prizing the advantages of a constitutional government, this meeting must protest against every interference with the undoubted right of petitioning, by an attempt to hurry an important measure through parliament, with such precipitation as leaves no opportunity to vast bodies of the people to express their opinions on its character and principles.

Moved by Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Bart.; seconded by Rev. Dr HOLLOWAY, supported by Rev. T. SCALES—

That in the event of the Maynooth bill passing the second reading, this Meeting will re-assemble, in order to take into consideration the duty of protestant electors at the next general election; that the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee convene such meeting as speedily as possible, and that in the mean time they take such preparatory steps as they may deem advisable.

Moved by Captain TROTTER; seconded by Rev. T. CUFFE—

That the cordial thanks of this meeting be given to R. C. L. Bevan, Esq., for his able and impartial conduct in the chair.

JAMES LORD, Secretary.

PROPOSED GRANT TO MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.

AT a MEETING of YOUNG MEN of the CITY of LONDON, held on WEDNESDAY EVENING, the 9th inst, at the GUILDHALL HOTEL, to consider the proposal of Her Majesty's Ministers permanently to endow the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth,

T. H. FRY, Esq., in the Chair,

it was unanimously resolved:

"That in consequence of the unusual haste with which the Government is attempting to carry so important a measure, this meeting calls upon the Young Men of London immediately to petition the House of Commons against the bill; and that a petition be prepared, and lie for signature throughout the metropolis."

An Executive Committee was subsequently appointed to carry out the objects of the meeting.

Copies of the petition, and petition sheets, will be furnished gratis, upon application to Mr Bruce, 1, Trump street, King street, Cheapside.

Communications to be addressed to Mr George Simmons, 303, Upper Thames street.

THE GRANT TO MAYNOOTH.

UNTO the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, The humble Petition of the subscribers, Members of the Baptist Denomination in Stirling and its immediate neighbourhood, Showeth—

That your petitioners, in common with the great majority of their countrymen, feel deeply aggrieved by the proposed grant to Maynooth college. They fully believe in the right of every man to worship God according to his conscience, without suffering on that account any penalty; but that is a distinct question from the present, which calls upon the country to support an institution for training men to propagate what the far greater number of the community believe to be fatal error. If the dependence of nations upon Divine Providence be admitted, can it be believed that the way to have its protection is to violate the will of Him who rules over all? and your honourable House knows that that is the light in which popery and the propagation of popery are regarded by the great majority of the community. As to the proposed measure being pleaded for as likely to conciliate Ireland, the answer is obvious: Without the divine blessing no means can produce good; and that God will bless means that violate his will, is not for a moment to be thought of.

May it, therefore, please your honourable House to refuse to sanction the proposed grant.

ENDOWMENT OF POPERY.

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE appointed at the Public Meeting, held on the 10th of March, for conducting the opposition to the Maynooth Endowment bill, are rejoiced to find that in every part of the empire the public feeling is manifesting itself with a depth, and earnestness, and unanimity, which they believe to be wholly without precedent.

The Committee still entertain a hope that the members of the House of Commons will not disguise the strong and unequivocal expression of the feelings of their constituents. Nevertheless, it is their duty to be prepared for the worst, and to contemplate the contingency that the bill may, for this session at least, pass through parliament.

Now, as the country has been fairly warned that the present measure merely paves the way for an endowment of the Romish priesthood in Ireland, it is abundantly clear that so vast a question can never be regarded as settled, until it has been brought before the various constituencies of the empire at a general election. For that general election, then, which cannot be far distant, the Committee will immediately begin to prepare. In the event of the passing of the present measure, they will endeavor to have a notice immediately given for its repeal, at the opening of the next session. In that session the Committee hope to be better prepared, by previous agitation, to bring the feelings of the country to bear upon the House of Commons. They trust to elicit a far larger number of petitions, to find means for making the Members better aware of the repugnance felt for the measure by their constituents, and thus in various ways to arouse the nation for one grand effort at the proper period.

But for these operations it will be necessary that they should be provided with adequate funds. They are happy to acknowledge the receipt of many donations within the last few days; but for the task which lies before them, a considerable sum of money will be requisite. They make this known without hesitation or reserve, and they have no doubt that the zeal which is now kindled throughout the land, will speedily supply them with the needful resources.

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Chairman,

JAMES LORD, Secretary.

London Coffee house, Ludgate hill, April 12th, 1845.

AT A SPECIAL MEETING of the DEPUTIES of PROTESTANT DISSENTERS of the THREE DENOMINATIONS—PRESBYTERIAN, INDEPENDENT, and BAPTIST—in and within Twelve Miles of London, appointed to protect their Civil Rights, and to consider the MAYNOOTH COLLEGE BILL, held at the KING'S HEAD TAVERN, in the Poultry, the 9th day of APRIL, 1845—

J. R. MILLS, Esq., in the chair:

It was moved by W. ALERS HANKEY, Esq.; seconded by NATHANIEL GRIFFIN, Esq., Barrister-at-Law; and resolved unanimously:—

That this Deputation, entertaining the conviction that State Endowments for religious purposes are equally at variance with the legitimate ends of government, and the true interests of religion, view with settled aversion the Bill now before Parliament for the permanent endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, and for placing the College and Buildings under the supervision of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland.

It was moved by DAVID WILLIAMS WIRE, Esq., and seconded by JOSIAH CONDER, Esq.:—

That, while the Bill in question is bad in principle, it is obviously unjust as to the means by which it is to be carried into effect, namely, with money taken out of revenues raised chiefly in Great Britain; and that this injustice is aggravated by the consideration of the measure being, according to the avowal of its advocates in Parliament, preparatory to the full endowment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, thereby involving the creation of another church establishment.

It was moved by JAMES COOK EVANS, Esq., barrister-at-law, and seconded by APSLEY PELLATT, Esq.:—

That in opposing the proposed perpetuation and extension of the grant to Maynooth college, this Deputation are but carrying out the principle on which they have heretofore opposed, and do now again firmly protest against, the annual grant made by parliament to the presbyterians in Ireland, and poor protestant dissenting ministers in England; and they distinctly deny the assertion that has been publicly made, to the effect that the protestant dissenters have never, until now, opposed the grant to Maynooth college, nor any of those numerous measures in Ireland and in the colonies, involving payments to Roman catholic priests for services performed as chaplains to prisons and workhouses, or otherwise—the fact being that this Deputation have embraced every suitable opportunity of expressing their entire disapprobation of the principle of such payments.

It was moved by JOHN BENNETT, Esq., and seconded by BENJAMIN HANBURY, Esq.:—

That, although this Deputation feel bound by their views of right and justice to oppose strenuously the endowment by the state of Roman catholic institutions, yet they assure their Roman catholic fellow subjects of their hearty and continued sympathy in all the wrongs which they endure.

It was moved by J. M. HARE, Esq., and seconded by EBEN-EEZER CLARK, Esq.:—

That a petition embodying the foregoing resolutions, and signed by the Deputies, be presented to the House of Commons, praying that House at once to reject the Maynooth College Endowment bill. That if, contrary to the reasonable expectation of this deputation, the House of Commons adopt a bill so repugnant to the feelings of the nation, this deputation will present a memorial to the Queen, praying her Majesty to be graciously pleased to dissolve parliament in order that her subjects may have an opportunity of expressing their sentiments on the new and dangerous line of policy adopted by her Majesty's present advisers.

It was moved by GEORGE OFFOR, Esq., and seconded by ROBERT STOCK, Esq.:—

That this deputation cannot separate without expressing an earnest hope that those members of the House of Commons who owe their return to parliament, either in whole or in part, to the votes of protestant dissenters, will give due weight to those considerations which the opponents of all state endowments for religious purposes have felt it to be their imperative duty to urge against the pending bill.

NATIONAL ANTI-CORN-LAW BAZAAR.

THE COUNCIL of the LEAGUE having determined upon holding a BAZAAR in the THEATRE ROYAL, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON, in aid of the ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND POUNDS FUND, beg to announce that it will OPEN ON THURSDAY, MAY 8, for exhibition, and on the succeeding MONDAY, the 12th of MAY, the sale of the articles will commence.

Many of the large manufacturing towns having intimated that they intend to furnish their stalls with articles illustrative of their staple manufacture, such contributions will not be removed at the period of sale, but remain on view till the close of the Bazaar.

Contributions may be forwarded, from the 15th of April to the 1st of May, addressed to George Wilson, Esq., Chairman, at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, London, where all the requisite arrangements will be made for their reception.

As the inquiry is repeatedly made, as to whether the articles sent to the Bazaar should have the prices affixed by the contributors, or by the Committee of Management in London, it is respectfully requested that, wherever practicable, the contributors themselves will affix their own prices to the articles according to the known cost of the raw materials, and the additional value given by the labour subsequently expended upon them.

Upon application, the Council will be happy to forward to any of the Local Committees, or individuals who are preparing contributions, labels, on which may be placed the description of the article—the price—and the name of the contributor.

The Council also would earnestly urge upon their friends in the smaller towns and rural districts, where, from a variety of causes, it may not be practicable to obtain contributions in the shape of manufactured goods, or articles of taste or fancy, that efforts should be made to collect money contributions, and forward them before the 1st of May, as Bazaar purses in aid of the League Fund.

Such of the Local Committees as intend to furnish a stall, are earnestly requested to communicate with the Council without delay.

Full particulars of the general arrangements will appear shortly.

(By order of the Council)

GEORGE WILSON, Chairman.

67, Fleet street, London, and
5, Newall's buildings, Manchester, April 3, 1845.

PATENT BELMONT SPERM CANDLES,
ONE SHILLING per lb.—**PATENT BELMONT SPERM OIL**, FOUR SHILLINGS per Gallon—burning more brilliantly than the ordinary Sperm Candles and Oil, and differing from them in being principally prepared from a pure vegetable material, instead of an impure animal one.

PRICES PATENT CANDLES, 10d. per lb.

VAUXHALL COMPOSITE CANDLES, 8d. per lb.

PATENT BELMONT WAX CANDLES, 1s. per lb.

Families wishing to try any of the above are recommended to order them through their own tradesmen, taking notice, however, that these being the London Cash Prices, the Country Dealer must charge higher to cover his expenses of carriage. Where no dealer can be found willing to sell them, EDWARD PRICE and Co. will supply quantities of not less than £5 worth, direct from their manufactory, at Belmont, Vauxhall. On receiving a Post Office Order for this amount, they will forward Candles and Oil in the proportions that may be directed; or, to parties wishing for samples and unable to obtain them, they will, on receiving a £1 Post Office Order, forward a box containing 3lb of each of the four sorts of Candles, and a gallon of the Oil. They fix the price of the sample box so high, to avoid all suspicion of their wishing to interfere with the retail trade of the Country Dealers.

The Trade may obtain the above Candles and Oil wholesale, in London, from EDWARD PRICE and Co., Belmont, Vauxhall; PALMER and Co., Sutton street, Clerkenwell; and WM. MARCHANT, 253, Regent circus, Oxford street; in Manchester, from RICHARDSON and ROEBUCK, Market place; in Bath, from T. and G. BUTCHER, No. 4, Shaw close; and in Cheltenham, from MATHREWS and Co., 400, High street.

Printed and published at the Office, at No. 4, Crane court, Fleet street, in the parish of St Dunstan in the West, in the city of London, by JOHN HENRY DAVIS, of No. 76, York road, Lambeth, in the county of Surrey, on WEDNESDAY,

THE PERFECT SUBSTITUTE for SILVER.

The material RIPPON and BURTON offer to the Public has, for the last ten years, been found equal to Silver, in appearance and sweetness, and superior to it in durability. Of the prices of Tea Sets, Waiters, Candlesticks, and all articles hitherto made in Silver, a detailed Catalogue, with Engravings, will be sent (gratis), post free.

Fiddle Threaded Victoria Pattern. Pattern. Pattern.

Table Spoons and Forks, full size, per dozen.....	12s. 0d.	28s. 0d.	30s. 0d.
Dessert, ditto, ditto, ditto	10s. 0d.	21s. 0d.	25s. 0d.
Tea, ditto, ditto, ditto	5s. 0d.	11s. 0d.	12s. 0d.
Gravy, ditto	3s. 0d.	6s. 0d.	7s. 0d.

FENDERS, STOVES, and FIRE-IRONS.—

The LARGEST ASSORTMENT of STOVES and FENDERS, as well as GENERAL IRONMONGERY, in the WORLD, is now on SALE at RIPPON and BURTON'S extensive Warehouses, 39, Oxford street, corner of Newman street (just removed from Wells street). Bright steel fenders, to four feet, from 30s. each; ditto, ditto, with ormolu ornaments, from 60s.; rich bronzed scroll ditto, with steel bars, 10s. 6d.; iron fenders, three feet, 4s. 6d.; four feet, 9s.; four feet, 11s.; wrought iron kitchen fenders, three feet, 4s. 6d.; four feet, 9s.; four feet, 11s.; wrought iron register stoves, with bronzed ornaments and two sets of bars, from 5 guineas; ditto, ditto, with ormolu ornaments, from £9 10s.; black dining-room register stoves, two feet, 20s.; three feet, 30s.; bed-room register stoves, two feet, 16s.; three feet, 21s. The new economical Thermio stove, with fender and radiating hearthplate, from £8 5s.; fire irons for chambers, 1s. 9d. per set; handsome ditto, with cut heads, 6s. 6d.; newest pattern, with elegant bronzed heads, 11s. A variety of fire irons, with ormolu and richly cut heads, at proportionate prices. Any article in furnishing ironmongery thirty per cent. under any other house, while the extent and variety of the stock is without any equal. The money returned for every article not approved of. Detailed catalogues, with engravings, sent (per post) free. Established (in Wells street) 1820.

ELECTRO-SILVERED DEANEAN PLATE.

—This beautiful manufacture possesses advantages which no other description of plated goods can offer. The union of the silver with its base being perfect, they constitute together but one body; and the silvery whiteness of the Deanean Plate renders the disappearance of the electric coating, after long time and constant use, scarcely observable. G. and J. Deane have just completed a very choice collection of Electro-Silvered Deanean Articles, comprising table and dessert spoons and forks, tea and gravy spoons, soup and sauce ladles, table and chamber candlesticks, sets of cruets and liqueurs, tea and coffee sets, and every other description of goods ordinarily manufactured in silver. George and John Deane's warehouse, show rooms, and manufactory, 46, King William street, London bridge.

METCALFE'S NEW PATTERN TOOTH BRUSH, and SMYRNA SPONGES.—

The Tooth Brush has the important advantage of searching thoroughly into the divisions of the teeth, and cleaning them in the most effectual and extraordinary manner, and is famous for the hairs not coming loose, 1s. An improved Clothes Brush, that cleans in a third part of the usual time, and incapable of injuring the finest nap. Penetrating Hair Brushes, with the durable unbleached Russian Bristles, which do not soften like common hair. Flesh Brushes of improved graduated and powerful friction. Velvet Brushes, which act in the most surprising and successful manner. The genuine Smyrna Sponge, with its preserved valuable properties of absorption, vitality, and durability, by means of direct importations, dispensing with all intermediate parties' profits and destructive bleaching, and securing the luxury of a genuine Smyrna Sponge. Only at METCALFE'S sole Establishment, 130 B, Oxford street, one door from Holles street. Caution—Beware of the words, "From Metcalfe's," adopted by some houses.

EASE in WALKING and COMFORT to the FEET.—

WELLINGTON street, Strand, London.—HALL and Co., SOLE PATENTEES of the PANNUS CORIUM, or Leather Cloth Boots and Shoes for Ladies and Gentlemen.—These articles have borne the test and received the approbation of all who have worn them. Such as are troubled with Corns, Bunions, Gout, Chilblains, or tenderness of Feet from any other cause, will find them the softest and most comfortable ever invented—they never draw the feet or get hard, are very durable, and adapted for every climate; they resemble the finest leather, and are cleaned with common blacking.

The Patent India Rubber Goloshes are light, durable, and waterproof; they thoroughly protect the feet from damp or cold.

Hall and Co's Portable Waterproof Dresses for Ladies and Gentlemen